HISTORY OF PEDAGOGY

BY

W. N. HAILMAN.

A 001413600 6
UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA
SAN DIEGO

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/twelvelectureson00hailiala

TWELVE LECTURES

ON THE

HISTORY OF PEDAGOGY,

DELIVERED BEFORE THE CINCINNATI TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION.

BY

W. N. HAILMAN, A. M.,

Author of "Kindergarten Culture" and "Object Teaching."

NEW YORK ·:· CINCINNATI ·:· CHICAGO

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1874, by
WILSON, HINKLE & CO.,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

HAILMANN HIST. OF PED.
E-P 21

715

PREFACE.

The twelve lectures on the History of Pedagogy, offered to the profession in this little volume, were delivered before the Cincinnati Teachers' Institute, in the summer of 1873. At the instance of Superintendent Hancock and many of the teachers who listened to the lectures, I have concluded to publish them in the present form.

It is needless to say that I do not claim to present even an abbreviated history of pedagogy. My aim was to sketch, in a concise form, the gradual growth of the leading principles of modern education, singling out for this purpose a few of the most prominent thinkers and workers in the field of pedagogy.

The great majority of teachers, on entering the pro-

fession, have had little opportunity of becoming acquainted with principles and methods of teaching, and confine themselves mainly to the imitation of their teachers. This is apt to make their teaching mechanical, soulless, devoid of high aims, so that they exercise very little if any influence upon the development of intelligence and character in the pupils; it prevents them from asserting their own individuality in their work, and thus keeps them from developing individuality in their pupils. At the same time, they are unable, for want of a firm basis, to contribute to the growth of correct principles in the profession, and are thus rather an impediment to progress.

It is true that, in the course of years, a number of them, by dint of experience and some study, become valuable, "live" members of the profession; but this entails a serious loss of time. Besides, the number of those who leave the profession without having done it any good, or who become petrified in certain fixed practices, is much greater.

To contribute to the abrogation of these evils is the object of this little volume. It is believed, too, that

a sketch like this, laying almost exclusive stress upon the most important principles that should underlie all education, and not encumbered with less important or even useless details and facts, will do more good in this direction than a complete, exhaustive history of pedagogy; nay, that the perusal of such a sketch, while it invites to the careful study of the history of pedagogy, is in most cases almost indispensable for a correct appreciation and application of historical facts subsequently acquired.

On this account, too, this little volume will be found more suitable, more fruitful of good results, as a textbook in normal and training schools, than more elaborate treatises on the same subject, which, while they pay great attention to dates and minor details, neglect the drift, the essential spirit of the subjects under consideration.

In the preparation of the lectures — not originally designed for publication — I made use, in some cases rather freely, of previous publications from my pen, without, however, impairing the value of the sketch, whatever that may be. The principal sources from

which I took facts, and in many cases views, are *Barnard's School Journal*, Schmidt's, Raumer's, Kruse's, Dittes's writings, and other works on the history of pedagogy, and the original writings of the pedagogic heroes introduced in the book.

May the little volume do its allotted share of good.

W. N. H.

Louisville,
April, 1874.

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

PAGE

Importance of History of Pedagogy — China and Japan . 9

LECTURE II.

Greece: General Features—Sparta—Lycurgus—Pythagoras—Athens—Solon 18

LECTURE III.

Greece: Socrates—Plato—Aristotle 31

LECTURE IV.

Rome: Numa Pompilius—General Characteristics—Advent of Greek Culture—Cicero—Seneca—Quintilian . . 42

LECTURE V.

Christianity—The Sixteenth Century—Bacon—Comenius . 52

LECTURE VI.

Locke—Francke 63

LECTURE VII.

PAGE
Rousseau 74

LECTURE VIII.

Influence of Modern Philosophers: Kant—Fichte—Richter—Schopenhauer—Hegel—Rosenkranz—Herbart—Benecke—Spencer 85

LECTURE IX.

Pestalozzi: Biographical 93

LECTURE X.

Pestalozzi: His Principles and Views 105

LECTURE XI.

Frederic Froebel—Kindergarten Culture 114

LECTURE XII.

Summing up—Conclusion 123

LECTURE I.

IMPORTANCE OF HISTORY OF PEDAGOGY—CHINA AND JAPAN.

THE history of any art or science is the great receptacle of the thoughts and achievements in that art or science; hence it furnishes the basis of progress. The man who re-invents the steam-engine to-day, proves himself a master mind; but his mastership does not benefit the race, which is already in possession of the steam-engine. On the other hand, the race would have been benefitted by the labors of this master mind if he had devoted his energies to the same field on the basis of James Watt's achievements. Thus, in education, too, the teacher who, ignorant of Pestalozzi's and Froebel's principles, re-discovers one or more of these, proves thereby that he is the peer of these pedagogic heroes, but his labors yield no gain to the race, and he would have been a much more useful member of the craft had he, even with inferior powers, devoted himself to the propagation of the principles discovered — to the apostleship, as it were, of Pestalozzi and Froebel.

Again, if we consider that the empiric in physical science must waste a great amount, not only of time

and working force, but also of material, in order to arrive at his results, we are justified in looking upon him as an absolutely injurious member of society, who destroys where he would create. Yet, in view of the abundance of inorganic material and its apparent indifference, we may forgive him his blundering, and while we pity him, we may still honor him. Not so with the blunderer in educational matters, whose material lives and grows, and, in consequence of his mistakes, may live and grow into misery and crime. Such a blunderer becomes a curse to society, and should not be countenanced. Indeed, it is no hyperbole if educational empiricism, in the family as well as in the school, is designated as "murder of the innocents."

How little this fact is generally appreciated, appears from the indifference of parents and average school authorities to the preparation of those whom they employ, in the very things which are of the greatest importance. The future teacher is examined in a number of arts and sciences, but little or no heed is given to his or her proficiency in educational principles and in pedagogic skill. The training of the youngest pupils, most easily impressed for good or evil, is still, in the majority of cases, intrusted to the least experienced, for the sake of economizing expense. In consequence of the numerous failures of so many who claim to do the teacher's work, the teacher's profession still struggles in a sort of disrepute, which exposes its votaries to want of confidence, to an income wholly incommensurate with the responsibilities, to the indignity of being re-examined again and again on the most absurd basis, and of feeling an annual nervousness concerning re-appointment.

There can be little doubt that these unfortunate facts are due mainly to professional ignorance and to a consequent utter demoralization of professional ethics. An irrefutable proof for this assertion is found in the marked improvement that characterizes the professional status of a few favored localities where talent, knowledge, and skill have attained at least a partial triumph.

It is evident that a knowledge of the history of education, an acquaintance with the thoughts of earnest men that have gone before us, a familiarity with the results of faithful laborers in similar fields, an intimacy with their struggles, their martyrdom, or their triumph, will do much to enhance our efficiency, as well as our professional self-respect, while, at the same time, it will rid us of every vestige of self-complacent pedantry and indolent, servile submission to arbitrary authority. While it will enable us to profit by the failures, as well as by the successes of our predecessors, it will teach us still to look ahead, and to strain every nerve in earnest, thoughtful efforts to approach the yet distant ideal.

In its widest sense, the history of education would be the history of the development of the human race. For the teacher specifically, however, it deals mainly with the intentional, systematic influence exercised by older individuals of the race upon younger ones, with a view of fitting them for life. It deals with the efforts made by the family, the school, the church, and similar organizations, to make the young suitable and more or less self-dependent members of the community. It can not ignore the influence of individual propensities and of external circumstances, but it attends to them only so far as they have a marked effect upon the direct educa-

tional efforts of family, school, and similar organizations. Among these organizations, again, the school will claim the greatest share of the teacher's attention. There are other limits, such as the degree of civilization of a state, the authenticity of its history, etc.; but these the history of education shares with all history, so that I need not dwell upon them here.

In the short course of lectures that you had the kindness to assign to me, it becomes, moreover, necessary to single out for study a few of the numerous threads that form the historical complex. In the selection of these, I have thought it best to choose those that have led to the new developing education, thus supplementing, to a limited extent, the lectures which I had the honor to deliver before you last year.

It is, then, my pleasant task to review with you the thoughts and deeds of a few earnest teachers of various times and nations, whose wisdom has gradually procured us the conviction that man is an organic being, subject, in all his manifestations of life, to laws of organic growth or development from within outward; that society is a similar though more complex organism; and that the aim of education must be the development of independent individualities, fitted for life in society, capable of happiness and efficient for usefulness, on the basis of morality and reason.

With such an aim, we find little to interest us in our search for data prior to the Greeks, and little outside of the Caucasian race. Only the Chinese and Japanese deserve a passing notice, more, however, because among them we find, in almost every respect, the opposite of our aims clearly crystallized.

Although Kong — who lived among the Chinese 500 years before Christ, whom they reverentially call "the Teacher," and who is esteemed among us under the Latinized name of Confucius — declared the destiny of man is to perfect himself, their entire educational system aims at limits so rigidly fixed that further development is impossible. Their scope of thought, their manners and customs, the entire social fabric, every thing that relates to the life of man, has assumed positive, unalterable forms; and the aim of Chinese education is the faithful transmission of old, established views and facts — the strict training in old, established usage. A free, independent development of human powers is not known; individuality is imprisoned within the walls of settled rules; the principle of stability is the criterion of this education which is eminently practical, egotistical, conventional, technical.

This view of the aim of education guides pedagogic practice in every direction. Physical life is protected, nursed, and subjected to strict discipline, because it determines the utility and the welfare of the individual; the muscles are trained to nimbleness and skill, because these are needed in the observance of a complicated ceremonial and in a number of trades; play and recreation are allowed to the young, to give them new vigor for new efforts. But calisthenic and gymnastic exercises, in the interest of general culture, find no place in the Chinese system of education, because their influence upon the entire organism of man, upon the physical economy as well as upon the intellect, the will, and the æsthetic sense, is not understood.

Morally, the aim is decorous conduct, but not moral

strength and moral feeling. Here usage and law enter with pedantic minuteness into every detail of life. Every motion, every position of the body, the number and depth of bows, the entire social ceremonial is prescribed for every imaginable case of intercourse with others. A complicated system of formalities, of police regulations and fines, usurps the place of plain truth, justice, and love. The voice of feeling and of conscience is drowned in usage and written law. The child learns how it must speak, stand, walk, and sit, but not how it shall feel and think. Hence result servility toward superiors and cruelty toward inferiors; dissimulation, falsehood, deceit, and a heartless egotism stalk abroad in the garb of conventional decorum and legality.

Hence, too, on the other hand, self-control, love of order, punctuality, industry, perseverance, prudence, caution, sobriety are the national virtues of the Chinese. But the higher interests of human nature, the cheerful exercise of pure morality, disinterested devotion to great ideas, appreciation of human dignity, desire for self-improvement, are almost wholly crushed in the iron fetters of practical life; so that the miserable human being, reduced almost to a machine, can find a sort of happiness only in the satisfaction of sensual appetites. Similarly, too, the religious life of the Chinese has, in the course of time, become petrified in unmeaning formalism, with no influence upon the sentiments of the worshipers.

A great deal of attention is paid to intellectual culture. Schools of all descriptions exist throughout the empire, and they are accessible to all. Who learns most attains the highest public office, even if he is the

son of the poorest laborer. The claims of applicants are sifted by the most searching competitive examinations, in which every precaution is taken to prevent deception. As soon as the Chinese boy is five years old he starts to school; and, although there is no law of compulsory education, personal interest and usage bring about a well-nigh universal and exceedingly regular attendance of the elementary schools, in which reading, writing, arithmetic, and lessons on common things constitute the curriculum.

The method of instruction is exclusively dogmatical, without a trace of developing elements; for positive knowledge and routine are the only aims of the teacher's labor, so that there is no time left for experiment and reflection. Telling and showing, strict discipline, and constant watchfulness constitute the task of the Chinese teacher; attentive listening, careful memorizing, faithful imitating, punctual and prompt reciting make up the business of the learner.

Thus, reading is taught in the following manner: the book, entitled "*Key to the Regions of Classical and Historical Literature*," is opened, and the teacher commences to read. The pupils, each one of whom has a book, repeat every word uttered by the teacher, pointing to the word with the forefinger, and looking intently at the printed symbol. Only one line is read, and this is repeated until the pupils have caught the pronunciation of every symbol, and are enabled to read the line without the teacher's assistance. After this, they must learn it by heart. This they do in a loud voice, each boy calling out the sounds to himself, until they are impressed upon his memory. As soon as he knows the

line by heart, he brings his book to the teacher, turns his back upon him, and recites the line. Then the teacher proceeds to the next line, until the whole book is learned by heart. No attention is paid to the meaning of the words and sentences, so that the pupil may read the whole book fluently without the least understanding of its contents. Explanations are reserved for the higher schools; but here, too, they have an exclusively dogmatic character.

Similarly writing is taught. The copies, set by the teacher, are placed under translucent paper, and the pupil follows the lines of the copy with his brush, until it is found that he can write independently.

This, with the very rudiments of arithmetic, or rather counting, and a few snatches of lessons on common things, constitutes the school learning of the majority, and furnishes the basis for more extended instruction, on a similar plan, in the higher schools. School education is confined almost exclusively to the male sex, and girls rarely receive any instruction.

On the other hand, the Japanese, who assign to woman, in every respect, a much higher position, educate also the girls in school. The general plan of schools and schooling is, however, in all essential features, similar to that of the Chinese. Nevertheless, the Japanese, distinguished by greater energy and independence of character, have saved a spark of progressiveness which, under recent astonishing developments, promises to burst into a magnificent flame, destined to consume all that is cruel, inhuman, and exclusive in Mongolian civilization, and to change the latter into a worthy competitor of the more favored Caucasian sister.

Thus, thanks to the respect which these nations have ever accorded to knowledge, to intellectual eminence, and, formerly at least, to moral worth; thanks to the philanthropic spirit that characterizes their institutions; thanks to the democratic impartiality with which they admit at least every male to the temple of science, and open for him the path to glory and distinction; they may yet, fertilized by occidental progressiveness, become thoroughly humanized — a truly free and happy people.

On the other hand, the Hindoos, Egyptians, and Persians, with their notorious caste institutions, that render individual development and emancipation absolutely impossible, that confine every man within arbitrary limits, according to his parentage, and make him an abject slave of a despotic church or state, have been doomed, by the logical justice of events, to a well-deserved oblivion or absorption by more vigorous peoples. We should find little to repay our efforts in the educational history of these, and we may therefore, without fear of loss, turn our attention at once to Greece, the great fountain-head of Western civilization.

LECTURE II.

GREECE: GENERAL FEATURES — SPARTA — LYCURGUS — PYTHAGORAS — ATHENS — SOLON.

THE Greek ideal of education is expressed by them in a magnificent word, combining in its elements "the beautiful and the good." Greek education aims at external and internal beauty and goodness; physical and psychical vigor, health, and energy; the harmonious culture of all the powers of body and soul. This is the general outcome of their educational efforts, although they were, at no time, and among none of the numerous tribes, fully faithful to it, even in theory. While, during the heroic age, physical and moral culture claimed their greatest attention, intellectual culture preponderated in later ages. Again, education bore in each tribe or state an individual character, more or less removed from the general formula.

From Homer's occasional pictures of family life, we gather that, during the heroic age, education was to a great extent patriarchal. The children were attached with filial piety to their parents. The father taught his son by example and precept, imparting to him

physical vigor and skill, and an intensely religious disposition. Similarly, the mother educated the daughter into a skillful and virtuous housewife. Later, at the dawn of the historical age of Greece, family life and family education were lost in state life and state education. At the same time, the Greeks were, from the beginning of this period, divided into several distinct and frequently hostile tribes, each one of which followed a different political and pedagogic direction.

It is true that in Greece, and more especially in Athens, the human powers enjoyed a freer development than in the great despotic empires of the East; but the Greek, too, did not attain his highest value as an individual or as a member of his family, but only as a member of his state. The independent worth of man and the significance of domestic life were never appreciated in Greece. She never enjoyed a universal education of the people; nay, the number of persons fully free and entitled to unlimited participation in national education and in public life was very small, compared with the number of the partially free, the serfs and slaves. At the same time, we have positive accounts only from the Dorians and Ionians — from Sparta and Athens — that the state looked upon education as a public concern.

Even the approximate data of the invasion and conquest of the southern Peloponnesus by the Dorians has been lost. Yet this is established, that the native population, probably Acheans, were ever after held in subjection. Those who had submitted voluntarily retained a limited part of their lands and their personal liberty, but had no share in the government. Those

who had to be subdued by the force of arms were reduced to the most abject slavery. The former were distinguished by the name of *Periœci;* the latter were the *Helots.* Neither of these had any share in the political economy of Sparta; and all that is known of Spartan education has exclusive reference to the 9,000 families of the conquerors, who constituted a supreme caste, exercising despotic sway over their unfortunate subjects. But within this ruling caste a remarkable community of interests prevailed — a community of interests so intense that all individuality was crushed in the iron grasp of the social fabric.

The principal object of Spartan education was the maintenance of the existing political system, the perpetuation of the supremacy of the ruling class, or caste. Hence physical strength and warlike skill were the leading objective points. With reference to the subordinate castes, Sparta's education was aristocratic; with reference to the surrounding states, military. The code of laws, which fixed with inflexible vigor all the details by which this aim was to be attained, is ascribed, mythically perhaps, to Lycurgus, whose doubtful existence is referred to the ninth century before Christ. This code regulates even marital relations in every detail, with a view to physically vigorous descendants But the children did not belong to the parents; they belonged to the state. The new-born infant was brought before certain officers of state, and if it was found to be sickly or deformed, it was not permitted to live.

The healthy and well-formed boys were left with their parents until their seventh year, where they

were brought up with the greatest simplicity. In their seventh year they were removed to special common schools or, rather, common homes; for henceforth they passed their youth in these. In their eighteenth year they left these common homes and entered military service. The girls were left in the parental home, where they acquired, under the mother's direction, the arts of spinning, of weaving, and of controlling slaves; they, too, however, had to appear at stated times in public places for gymnastic exercises, similar to those of the boys. Indeed, woman occupied among the Spartans a much higher position than in the rest of Greece, as is indicated by the fact that the Doric tribe can boast of quite a number of poetesses. Her physical pre-eminence is most forcibly indicated in one of the plays of Aristophanes, where an Athenian lady exclaims to a Spartan sister: "How beautiful you are! how fresh your skin! how swelling your form! you could strangle an ox."

The gymnastic exercises, which formed the principal burden of Spartan education, consisted mainly of the celebrated *pentathlium*, or five-fold contest. It embraced leaping, running, wrestling, throwing of the javelin or spear, and of the discus or quoit. These five exercises formed the classical cycle of gymnastics. Brutal boxing and professional athletics are not found before the decline of Greece.

Intellectual culture was confined in Sparta almost exclusively to music; and, even here, the burden of the songs and hymns was mainly of a moral and religious character, tending to arouse and to strengthen valor and patriotism, or to glorify the gods. The boys and youths

were instructed in the use of the seven-stringed lyre, or cithara, and were taught to sing singly and in chorus, and to accompany their songs with rhythmical marches and dances. Reading and writing formed no part of Spartan education, and was left to private efforts in leisure hours. There was a little rudimentary arithmetic, and a little astronomy; but the higher arts and sciences found no home here; and oratory, as well as the drama, was prohibited. On the other hand, the understanding was trained with great care; the young were taught to form accurate and clear ideas about their surroundings, and accustomed to brevity and condensation of expression (laconism), and to promptness in answering. At the same time, truthfulness, simplicity, self-control, and well-nigh absolute self-denial, were constantly inculcated by example, precept, and practice. In short, a warlike spirit, military fitness, strength of character, reverence for the gods, and patriotism, were the ultimate ends of Spartan education. Science and art, as well as heart-culture, were neglected. The Spartan was the limit of all individual progress; to go, or even to aim beyond this, was in many cases a crime; in all cases, distasteful.

Such an organism — if, indeed, such a society can be honored by this name — can not have permanence, and does not deserve it, however perfect it may appear when viewed absolutely. Hence, as soon as she had shown her power in the Peloponnesian war, and had satisfied her thirst for conquest, Sparta degenerated and lingered ingloriously out of existence.

Before leaving the Dorian system of education, we must, however, throw a glance upon its noblest repre-

sentative, Pythagoras. He was born on the island of Samos, about the year 570 B. C. Introduced to the love of wisdom by Thales, Anaximander, and other great men of his time, he undertook extensive travels in Asia and Egypt, in order to perfect himself. After his return, he found so little encouragement among his Samian countrymen, that he concluded to emigrate. After a short stay at Creta, where he was initiated into the holy mysteries, and at Sparta, where he became familiar with the code of Lycurgus, he turned to the Greek colonies of lower Italy, known at that time by the name of Magna Græcia, and settled in the city of Croton. Here his personal appearance and eloquence, as well as his wisdom and virtue, not only won him the respect and admiration of the inhabitants, but enabled him to banish, as by charm, all kinds of vices from the people, and to plant in their stead the seeds of virtue.

In addition to his lectures to the adult population, he founded here a great school for the education of youth. In the selection of his pupils he was exceedingly careful, inquiring minutely into all the details of their character and disposition, especially their susceptibility and obedience. The school itself consisted of two courses, the exoteric and the esoteric course. The time of education comprised usually five years, from the twelfth to the seventeenth year of age.

During the first three years the pupils were in the exoteric course. During this time they received little direct attention; they listened and obeyed, learned what they were taught, and were not permitted to ask any questions, even when they desired explanation. The master delivered his discourses to the esoterics in

a room separated from the exoterics by a curtain, so that the latter were not allowed to see him or to have personal intercourse with him during the hours of instruction. At the end of the three years, they were subjected to a rigid examination, and, if they proved to be sufficiently docile, if their powers of attention and memory enabled them to follow a discourse, if they had the passions under full control, they were admitted to the esoteric circle, and to full communion with the master. The pupils spent their whole time at the school, and formed a kind of family, that defrayed its expenses from a common fund, into which the pupils deposited their fortunes on entering the school, and which was administered by the pupils themselves, through the medium of officers whom they selected.

Although Pythagoras was not a Dorian, either by birth or by abode, his system of pedagogy was Doric in the purity and strictness of its morals; in the implicit obedience it required; in its positive, authoritative method: in the scanty diet to which it subjected the pupils; in the importance given to gymnastics; in its seclusion from the common people; in its aristocratic tendencies throughout.

In the school itself, religious ceremonies and contemplation occupied an important place. In addition to music, mathematics, physics, geography, and metaphysics, were the favorite pursuits of the Pythagoreans. The method of instruction was strictly dogmatic. Knowledge was transmitted in short, condensed sentences, which invited to reflection by their form, as well as by their contents. For instance: "What are the islands of the blest?" "Sun and moon." Or:

"What is the wisest thing?" "Measure and number." "What the most beautiful?" "Harmony." "The most powerful?" "Intelligence." "The best?" "Happiness." Or: "The beginning is one-half of the whole." "The ocean is a tear." "The sound of a metal is the voice of an imprisoned spirit." Or: "It is man's duty to marry and raise children, so that the deity may have worshipers and servants."

In other respects, his method had many excellent features; he gave little at one time, proceeded in strict continuity, required full assimilation of the given material. On the other hand, he did not seem to appreciate the insufficiency of the scientific attainments of his time, and taught many mere hypotheses and fancies, in the voice of a prophet, as established truths. The faults of his system bore their legitimate fruits after the death of the great master. His school became, in one direction, a kind of political club with aristocratic principles, directing its efforts against the liberty of the people. In another direction, it became an arrogant school-sect, which, with its secret wisdom, deemed itself infinitely superior to the rest of mankind. Thus it aroused the distrust and hatred of the citizens, and died, not without persecution, about 300 years B. C. It is doubtful whether modern pedagogy has profitted by the example of the Pythagorean school. We still see, now and then, vast structures raised on the basis of a few correct ideas; structures in which all knowledge and all wisdom find a resting-place.

As the Dorian system of education was based, in its main features, upon the legislation of Lycurgus, so Ionian culture rested upon a code of laws devised by

Solon. Solon was born at Athens about the year 639 B. C. His integrity, his wisdom, his justice and piety, his humanity and patriotism, gained him the affection of the Athenians, and, about the year 594 B. C., he was elected chief ruler of the commonwealth, and invested with unlimited dictatorial power. He availed himself of his position to give to Athens a social and political constitution, by far less aristocratic than that of the Spartans. True, it left nearly three-fourths of the inhabitants in a state of slavery, less intolerable, however, than that of the Spartan helots; but he abolished serfdom for debt, by which, heretofore, many free-born citizens had lost their liberty. It is true, too, that he recognized a kind of aristocracy, by dividing the free citizens into four classes; but it depended on wealth and not on birth, so that the free citizens of the lowest class could, by means of energy or luck, reach the highest. And although the magistrates could be selected only from the three higher classes, all free citizens took part in the sovereign popular assemblies and in the juries; so that, in opposition to the eminently and thoroughly aristocratic Spartan institutions, the Athenians could boast of being members of a kind of democratic commonwealth. On the whole, his laws set no limits to the free development of the powers of the people, and favored more especially intellectual progress.

But we are more particularly concerned with the educational features of the Athenian republic. Since the character of a state depends upon the character of its citizens, Solon's code paid much attention to education. He considered the parents as the masters of the

children, but prohibited the sale of girls, which was still customary among the Athenians. He did not forbid the exposing of children, but the humane tendencies of the Athenian mind — due, undoubtedly, to his wise legislation — gradually abrogated this inhuman practice.

The boys were to learn at least the arts of swimming and reading, as well as some industrial, agricultural, or commercial pursuit, by which they might gain their living. He recommended the wealthy, at the same time, to have their sons instructed in gymnastics, music, mathematics, poetry, and philosophy. If the father failed to do his duty in the education of his son, he had no claims to the support of his son in old age; while all well-educated young men were obliged to take care of their parents, and forfeited public honor and civil rights by neglecting this duty.

Athenian education was a common affair of the family and of the state. The wealth, insight, and good-will of the father determined to what extent his sons might avail themselves of public or private educational institutions. Compulsory education, like that of our time, did not exist; the state was satisfied with offering to the rising male population gratuitous instruction, and with exciting in all parents a lively interest to let their sons avail themselves of this instruction. The constitution of the state, the condition of industry and commerce, the numerous public monuments of art, the character of religion, the theater, the publicity of political life and of the administration of justice, the absence of all castes, and the fact that every free-born male could work his way to the highest culture and to the highest

offices, conspired to the universal arousal and development of intellectual vigor; and no city in the world has done as much as Athens for the culture of the human race.

Still we find that even Athens was very far removed from the ideal education of our days. In the first place, the children of the slaves were, as a rule, excluded from the education of the free-born; for they were in every respect private property, and had no share in public life. With reference to female education, Athens was even inferior to Sparta. Unlike the Spartan women, the women of Athens had no share in public education, not the shadow of a direct influence upon public concerns, and very little authority even at home; they were looked upon as inferior beings, and were treated with almost Oriental contempt.

For the boys, the gymnasia were the most important educational institutions. They were public places and buildings similar to the gymnasia of Sparta. Their expenses were defrayed from the public treasury, and gymnastics formed, in the beginning at least, their main field of pedagogic influence. In the course of time, however, they became the centers of all higher intellectual life, taking in every respect the place of our high-schools and universities. Still, even in the beginning, the Athenians laid more stress, in their gymnastic courses, upon plastic beauty, while the Spartans were satisfied with agility and strength.

In addition we find, at an early period, elementary schools, in which boys from seven to twelve years old were taught the arts of reading and writing, and received instruction in literature and arithmetic; these

were, probably, also maintained at public cost. There can be little doubt that these elementary schools were especially instrumental in adding intellectual culture to the curriculum of the gymnasia, which became the public schools for the boys from the twelfth year of age upward.

For reading, the elementary schools used the spelling method, acquainting the pupil first with the letters, which were compounded successively into syllables, words, sentences. Writing consisted in mere imitation of set copies. Arithmetic was a rare accomplishment, few progressing beyond the art of counting on their fingers. Higher intellectual culture that could not be found in the elementary schools (pedagogiums) or gymnasia, was a private affair; but the number of private schools and private teachers, shows that it was the desire and purpose of a vast number to avail themselves of such culture for their sons. During leisure hours the boys passed their time in the company of their parents, or engaged in social games similar to those in which our boys delight to-day, where the military drill system of the school and police regulations are not in the way.

Athenian education aimed at a harmonious development of all the powers; it would produce independence of character, self-confidence; it required careful observation of circumstances and of persons, vigor and prudence, energy and wisdom; it would make the Athenian patriotic and brave, a lover of liberty and of virtue, of science and art, of the good and the beautiful.

Yet their education had one great fault, suffered from one great falsehood, as it were, which ultimately caused its decay: it was thoroughly particularistic. Not the

harmoniously developed, æsthetically cultivated, beautiful and good human being was its aim; but the Athenian, or, at best, the Greek. Their education lacked a high moral ideal of pure humanity.

Nations whose education has this fault, no matter how perfect they may be in other respects, always die, and ought to die. Nations, as well as individuals, that aim at ideals which they can attain, ultimately cease to progress; or, in other words, begin to perish as soon as the ideals are reached.

LECTURE III.

GREECE: SOCRATES — PLATO — ARISTOTLE.

THE elements of decay, mentioned at the close of the last lecture, did not exist in the principles and practice of a few gifted teachers, among whom I shall single out for rapid review Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle. There was so much of the purely humane in these great men, that, even to-day, they stand out as brilliant examples of wisdom and virtue, as earnest searchers after truth, unbiased by national or other prejudices.

So far, indeed, was Socrates in advance of his countrymen in this respect, that the very ideas which have secured him immortality among men, and the grateful reverence of every lover of truth, were looked upon by the Athenians as a crime punishable with death. Socrates was born at Athens about 469 B. C. He learned in his youth the art of his father, a sculptor, but devoted himself afterward to philosophy. He fought creditably in several campaigns of the Peloponnesian war, and on his return, secured against want by a small fortune, he devoted his riper years to the public service — to the study and instruction of youth and men in search of

knowledge. His stern morality and fearless love of truth gave offense to the corrupt party that controlled the state; he was accused of contempt of the gods, and of misleading the youth of the city, condemned to death, and drank the cup of hemlock in the year 400 B. C.

Interesting as his philosophical system is, we must pass it by, in order to devote our time to that which concerns us more particularly — his method. Suffice it to state that, starting with a firm conviction that one all-wise, all-loving God reveals himself in the reason and conscience of man, and that the soul of man is immortal, the great aim of his philosophy is self-knowledge; that he refers all knowledge to this — to human life; that he eschews all belief in authority, and accepts as knowledge only what is proved; that he looks upon self-knowledge as the only source of true insight, and upon this as the only source of true virtue and happiness. To lead men to a love of knowledge, of truth, to assist them in their search after self-knowledge, was for him the noblest occupation, the one by which he could confer the greatest benefit upon his community: to him teaching was a divine calling.

His method was conversational and, at least so far as the subject in dispute was concerned, developing. He did not start with definitions and theorems, in order to deduce from them, and to classify with their aid the concrete phenomena of the world and of human life; but he led inductively from concrete facts and examples to ideas and convictions of higher orders. He did not present to the learner finished systems, but he placed himself upon the stand-point of the learner, induced him to express his ideas accurately; if the latter were

correct, he confirmed them by new illustrations and developments; if they were incorrect, he showed their absurdity by first admitting them, and then leading the learner to the legitimate consequences of the erroneous idea. This he accomplished by skillful questioning, throwing the burden of thought upon the learner, who was delighted to find himself apparently assisting the beloved and respected teacher in the search for truth, and who gathered new strength from every new error which he discovered in his reasonings, aided by the incomparable *socratic irony.*

Ideas should not, according to him, be implanted from without, but logically developed from within; they should grow, as it were, in the self-active mind of the learner, until they are sufficiently clear to be expressed, sufficiently advanced *to be born.* Hence he loved to compare his art with that of the obstetrician, in which his mother had been an adept; and he considered aptness to teach immeasurably more important in the teacher than mere positive or material knowledge, which may be accumulated in the weakest brain.

Of himself he said: "Properly speaking, I have never been any body's teacher; but if any one desired to hear what I said, I have never begrudged him, nor asked how old he was. Also, I do not instruct only for money, but I am equally ready to converse with rich and poor, and whoever wishes it, may answer and hear what I have to say.... But if any one maintains that he has learned or heard something from me, especially what all of you have not heard, you may know that he does not speak the truth." By this, undoubtedly, he would imply that what his pupils knew they had learned by their own

self-active efforts, and that he had only aided them in becoming conscious of their ideas.

Unlike Pythagoras, he had not a closed school, but conversed freely with all who wanted to listen to him or to answer him, at all times and in all places. A few young men, who seemed suitable to him by personal appearance, age, and ability, he attached to himself as special pupils, that attended him more regularly, and whom he instructed and improved by wise words and blameless example.

Although he was not a teacher of children, his method is, nevertheless, the true one even for elementary training; for inasmuch as it insists upon the arousing of self-activity on the part of the learner, and proceeds inductively, it contains the germs of the developing method, which is gradually and surely, with the slowness and irrepressibility of truth, working its way into our schools.

The teaching and life of Socrates had made a deep impression upon his pupils; but, as might be expected, few of them succeeded in comprehending the master in his vast universality. The majority of them took a one-sided view of him; had become dazzled, as it were, by one flash of his brilliant genius, and had been comparatively blinded to the rest. At the same time, the method of Socrates tended to strengthen their individuality, and to transform their zeal into enthusiasm, so that a number of them became the founders of one-sided schools of philosophy. Thus Antisthenes founded the cynical school, which sought virtue and happiness in the absence of wants, and which Diogenes reduced to absurdity by a sort of practical socratic irony. On the

other hand, Aristippus and his followers, the Cyrenians, held that pleasure was the only good and pain the only evil, and that, therefore, pleasure was the highest object of pursuit. Again, Euclid and Stilpo established the Megarian school, which attached undue importance to dialectics, the art of debating, and which was lost ultimately in formalism.

Fortunately, however, there was among the pupils of Socrates one genius who comprehended him in all his fullness and universality; who had the power, as one of his critics remarks, of collecting in a focus the scattered rays of truth proceeding from the master, and of forming them into a system of philosophy. This genius is Plato.

Plato was born 429 years B. C., at Athens, from a good family; indeed, Codrus and Solon are named among his ancestors. He was educated with great care. He took great delight in painting and poetry, until he became acquainted with Socrates in his twentieth year, when he began to devote himself exclusively to the study of philosophy. After the death of Socrates, he visited the school of Euclid, at Megara; went subsequently to Cyrene and to Egypt, and ultimately to lower Italy and Sicily, in order to become familiar with the Pythagorean school. In his fortieth year he returned to Athens, where he passed the rest of his days, with a few short interruptions, in the academy, in the circle of devoted pupils. He died 348 B. C., in the eighty-first year of his life.

Plato has never exercised any influence upon educational practice, but he was the first to make the theory of education the subject of strictly scientific inquiry;

and this is, for us, his great merit. Inasmuch as he was still a Greek, and, by birth and the Doric influence of Magna Græcia, an aristocrat, his educational system has many faults, which our time, nearer to pure humanity than his, can only deprecate.

Thus he, too, merged the individual and even the family in the state, and looked upon education as the exclusive concern, the privilege and duty of the state. He considered the objects and the power of the state binding for every individual, and denied to parents all control over their children. He favored, in his Republic, a sort of *caste* in which the philosophers, as rulers of the state, occupied the first rank, and were supported by the guardians of the state, or warriors. The comforts of life were to be supplied by the artisans and farmers, and by the slaves, who were denied the benefits of an education. Women were important to him only as the mothers of future generations, and were in every other respect considered as inferior beings.

On the other hand, he shows that education is the noblest and most important of all callings. He insists upon harmonious culture, keeping the physical and intellectual development in proper balance: because an organism in which the intellect prevails over the body is exposed to dangerous, nay, fatal morbid irregularities; and an organism in which great physical strength is combined with a weak mind, is sure to perish from the worst of all diseases, ignorance. He bestows the greatest care upon moral training, and would banish from the productions of plastic art and of poetry every thing that might mislead reason or corrupt morality.

His practical directions are built consistently upon this

basis. They have the great merit of forming the first complete, harmonious system — a machinery whose gearing is perfect. But since they never exerted any direct influence upon practical education, and since all their features that bear upon the history of the developing method have been mentioned in the second lecture and in the review of Socrates, I make haste to pass to the next and greater hero of Greek education, the great Stagirite, Aristotle, whose universality and comprehensiveness, whose advanced liberality and humanity, whose mental vigor and energy have earned him the surname "Alexander of the intellectual world."

Aristotle was born 384 B. C., at Stagira, in Macedon. In his seventeenth year he became a pupil of Plato at Athens, and remained with him for twenty years. His industry, zeal, and success were so great that Plato is said to have called him the "philosopher of truth," and "the soul of his school." At a later period the two great men became, however, estranged, probably on account of the differences in their modes and fields of thought. Plato was the philosopher of the ideal; Aristotle, of the real: Plato started with general ideas, and ignored nature; Aristotle held fast to nature, investigated its laws, keeping aloof from all arbitrary hypotheses and speculations: Plato had been well-nigh absorbed by the Pythagorean method of deducing particulars from generals; Aristotle had returned to the method of Socrates, and aimed to proceed from particulars to generals. What wonder if the two natures became estranged?

In his mature age Aristotle became the teacher of Alexander the Great, but returned afterward to Athens, where he devoted himself to study, to writing, and to

higher instruction in the Lyceum. After a stay of thirteen years, he was accused of impiety by a prominent Athenian, who alleged that, in a poem to his murdered friend Hermias, he worshiped the latter as a god. He fled on this account to Chalcis, on the island of Eubœa, where he died 322 B. C., in the sixty-second year of his age.

His numerous writings show that he was master of all the realms of knowledge of his time to an extraordinary extent, and that he increased the scope of all. Indeed, his writings became the principal and, in many respects, the exclusive source of the higher culture of antiquity and of the middle ages. Proceeding analytically on the secure foundation of experience, of reality, he almost created natural science and logic, and established ethics, political economy, and anthropology on a scientific basis. His pedagogy is based on knowledge of human nature; it forms, even to-day, a fair criterion of education; for he is much more liberal, much more humane, much less Greek, much nearer to the broad, cosmopolitan views of our days, than his predecessors and cotemporaries.

He still looks upon the state as the highest exponent of human life; but he recognizes, too, the dignity of the family, and even of the individual, whose happiness is the only legitimate object of the state. He still considers it the duty of the state to secure the education of the young in the aggregate; but in all details he asks for free development, untrammeled by petrified legislation; and he pronounces positively against the omnipotence of the state in educational affairs. He still acknowledges slavery and the inferiority of women; but

he educates the former and grants the latter equality, at least in the family.

He claims that the character of man depends on nature, habit, and instruction. Habit and instruction constitute education. They should always be together, but so that habit precedes. Habit is to prepare the mind for the ethical instruction. Only where there are good habits, principles can have an ennobling influence. But, in all cases, education must aim with nature at rational and harmonious perfection of all the powers of the child. The physical life of the child must be developed with care, and subjected to a rational discipline; the intellectual powers must be trained in all directions; but the highest aim of education is found in the ethical refinement of the young human being, in guiding him to justice, truthfulness, charity, self-control, firmness of character, etc. Again, in all educational efforts, the individuality of the pupil is to be taken into account, as the most important factor in the final result.

The opposition of Aristotle's views to those of Plato extends also to the curriculum of study. Plato attaches great importance to mathematics, because it leads from the concrete to the abstract, from the real to the ideal; Aristotle assigns a subordinate place to it, because it has no bearing upon the ethical nature of man. Plato opposes poets and artists, whom Aristotle commends. In opposition to Plato, Aristotle insists upon the study of history as an important branch of instruction, and deprecates mythical lore, for which Plato has great respect. Plato sought religion in the ceremonies; Aristotle found it in the heart of man.

The sketch of this great man — it would be unjust to call him merely a great Greek — would lack a very important element of completeness, were I to ignore a few directions which he gives for pedagogic practice — for method of teaching. At the head of these stands the principle that, in all instruction, in every investigation, we must start from known truths, known concepts or facts within our personal experience. Does this not remind us of Pestalozzi? Again, he teaches that learning is naturally agreeable, and he enables his pupils to find pleasure in it by arousing their own activity — their self-activity, as Froebel would say. He condemns violent physical exercises, athletic sport for the young; in music (singing), he would keep within the scope of the voice; grammatical instruction he bases upon reading. Perhaps many a school man of our days could learn pedagogic wisdom from Aristotle; perhaps many a school of our days would make great strides toward the developing method of education, would make stronger individualities, better and happier men and women, if it were to adopt the Aristotelian principles of teaching.

Socrates began the study of the Greeks as human beings — indeed, to him, who had traveled so little, they were the human race — and found a confused mass of scattered truths. These, Plato arranged and united in a beautiful, harmonious system. But it was a specifically Greek system; it would monopolize truth for Greece; it would make the Greeks a superior race, better and happier, it is true, than the barbarians, but better and happier at their expense; it would cut the isthmus of Corinth, and make the Peloponesus the abode

of a sort of human gods or of god-like human beings; a kind of temple which the barbarians could approach only as worshipers, and enter as slaves. Then there came, in time, from beyond the isthmus, the great Stagirite who defeated the selfish project, and conquered the great wisdom of the little community for the world.

Aristotle is the connecting link between Greek civilization and the European civilization of later periods; through him and because of him, Greek civilization expanded into European civilization, and into the cosmopolitan civilization of our days — the civilization that asks not after nationality, or birth, or station, or sex, but that would unite all human beings in one great brother- and sisterhood of strong individuals, whose equal duty is virtue, whose equal privilege is happiness.

LECTURE IV.

ROME: NUMA POMPILIUS — GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS — ADVENT OF GREEK CULTURE — CICERO — SENECA — QUINTILIAN.

THE educational history of the Romans is not so brilliant as that of the Greeks. Still they occupy an important place in the history of pedagogy, inasmuch as they preserved, to some extent, the Grecian achievements; inasmuch as they developed the utilitarian side of education; but more especially because they did much by their institutions, although unintentionally, for the emancipation of the female portion of mankind, because they began, in this respect, the work which our own country is destined to complete.

In the mythical history of Rome, Numa Pompilius occupies a position similar to the one of Lycurgus in the history of Sparta. Like Lycurgus, Numa Pompilius is looked upon, in the traditions of his people, as the founder of the state and of national ethics. He made religion the soul and guardian of civilization. The property and life of the citizens were in the protection of the gods; heavenly powers guarded all relations of

life — matrimony, the family, society, commerce, agriculture, politics. Such a system was not without its dangers; for in regulating the worship of the various deities, and in establishing and incorporating a number of separate priesthoods, he introduced the system of state religion, which still exercises its baneful influence on European civilization, even in England. But the sound common sense of the Romans never allowed priesthood the exercise of a decisive influence upon education, nor its exclusive management.

Numa's predecessor, Romulus, had founded and established the state, and secured it against the hostilities of neighbors. Numa would make peaceable citizens of the warlike inhabitants of the city; he would, for this purpose, strengthen and ennoble the ties of domestic, social, and political life, and, at the same time, procure a firm foundation for prosperity and morality by enhancing the interests of agriculture and of the trades. His position and his personal virtues, as well as the comparative smallness of the young state, favored his efforts.

All the various ranks and trades, instituted by him, rest on one common ethical basis, of which patriotism is the main center. However, all invidious distinctions of rank yielded, in the course of time, before the consistent opposition of the plebeians against the privileges of the patricians, and made room for civil equality of all citizens. Still, slavery was maintained by Rome always, and even extended, in such a way as to render it the darkest stain in her much-praised humanity, which, indeed, never reached in Rome the high standard that Numa's institutions might lead us to expect. The

long struggle for existence in the beginning, and, afterward, the ambitious strife for the supremacy of the world, led the people more and more astray from the peaceable paths and humane aims of Numa.

The life of the Romans, and hence, too, their education, was decidedly practical, utilitarian in its nature; it was guided by considerations of necessity, utility, and expediency. The ideality of the Athenians, the unbroken serenity of life, the harmonious culture of man for its own sake, the universal development of beauty found no home in the Roman mind. The Romans had no liberal gymnastics, nor a purely intellectual culture; physical and mental development were not in themselves aims, but only means to make a living, to become fit for civil and military service. Sober reason decided whether a thing was useful or not; and only what appeared useful was carried on within the narrow limits of usefulness. Agriculture, the mechanic arts, military service, and swimming offered sufficient opportunities for physical exercise. Art was esteemed only on account of its beauty; it labored for the wants of daily life, of the state, of public worship; but its æsthetic independence, its freedom in the realms of fancy, was not recognized. Sciences, too, were carried on as far as they were practical: jurisprudence and Roman history, because they served to regulate civil and political life; agriculture, because it taught how to increase the yield of the soil. The candidates for public service studied rhetoric, because it was essential to success.

The ethics of the old Romans was distinguished by purity and high virtue. Roman youths were trained

very early in obedience and loyalty, in frugality and self-control, in energy and perseverance, in fidelity and justice. But the Romans, like all other nations of antiquity, had never risen to a recognition of human rights and human duties; their virtues were confined to their intercourse with fellow-citizens; and Roman patriotism superseded the laws of humanity; they were always Romans, right or wrong; they were Romans first, Romans last, Romans forever. Hence their whole history is characterized by harshness, and even cruelty and violence; by an insatiable passion for conquest; by a constant pursuit of material advantages; by an endless chase after the external blessings of life. But, while Numa had based the acquisition of these upon honest labor, the Romans of later periods — not unlike the gentlemen of our time — sought a maximum of gain with a minimum of labor. At the same time, an inordinate desire for enjoyments of the grossest kind, the most shameless profligacy, took the place of the Roman frugality of earlier periods. Religion degenerated into mere routine service with the people, into a trade with the priests, into a political engine with the statesmen. In short, Numa's spirit gradually fled from all spheres of Roman life.

About the middle of the third century B. C., Greek culture was introduced in Rome, and the wealthy Romans made rapid strides in science and art. But it was Greek science and art, and the Greeks were already a degenerate people. With foreign culture they imported, too, foreign vices; and they were equally ready and apt in acquiring the latter, thus accelerating the political and moral decline of the

proud commonwealth, and verifying the prophecy of the stern Cato, who wrote to his son about the close of the second century B. C.: "Believe me, as if a prophet had said it, that the Greeks are a worthless and incorrigible race. If this people diffuse its literature among us, it will corrupt every thing."

In the educational practice of ancient Rome, the family occupied the highest place. The father was unlimited master of the family; in his hands rested even the life and death of the children; a power which was, however, mitigated by the great consideration accorded to the mother of the family — the matron. For a number of years the care of the children was the almost exclusive province of the Roman mother. She attended not only to their physical wants, but formed their language, their ideas, their moral sentiments and principles, their religious feelings. She was, to a great extent, what Pestalozzi would have the modern mother become. In the course of time, slavery extended its pernicious influence even upon the Roman mothers; they, too, were affected by the general corruption of Roman ethics, and the system of nurses became so universal that only the poorest mothers nursed their children themselves.

Next to the mother, the father occupied the most important place in Roman family education. By his greater authority he sustained the pedagogic labors of the mother. While she was principally concerned with the physical and ethical training of the children, and with the practical instruction of the daughters, the father busied himself with the intellectual culture, more particularly, of the boys, whom he made familiar

with the gods of the family and of the state, with the history and constitution of the commonwealth, with civil and social institutions; and whom he prepared for some profession or trade. Of course, this instruction was neither systematic nor based upon books, but appealed exclusively to the experience, the powers of observation, the common sense and memory of the boy.

When the arts of reading and writing — which, in the beginning, only very few children had learned from their fathers — became more necessary, a sort of public school was established and attended even by girls; and when Greek culture came to conquer the state that had conquered Greece, a host of teachers taught Greek and Latin grammar, rhetoric, literature, philosophy, music, and other sciences and arts. Still, education never became a concern of the state, but was left entirely to private and corporate enterprise; so that the children of the poor learned little or nothing, for want of time and money. On the other hand, the wealthier houses attached to the persons of their children quite a retinue of pedagogues, who were selected from the slaves of the household, or hired from the ranks of educated persons that had failed in other callings, or lacked energy to engage in other pursuits.

Among the Roman writers on education before the Christian era, Terentius Varro occupied, undoubtedly, a high rank; but his productions, although quite numerous, have been lost, or are preserved in so fragmentary a condition that it is impossible to obtain a clear insight into his views. It is a significant fact that he attached much importance to early education, as exercising the greatest influence upon life; and that he

advocates a mild discipline, since harshness neutralizes instruction, and since the latter can thrive only if the learner finds his task a pleasant one.

The rhetorical and philosophical works of the great Cicero, the father of modern classical prose, contain a number of ideas on education, with special reference to the training of the orator. He looks upon education as the process by which the natural talents of man are perfected, and upon virtue as its ultimate aim. He would have the teacher mild, strict, and just. Punishment, in word or deed, must never degrade, and must never be administered in anger. He attaches great importance to religion, as a means of moral training. He would have education begin with earliest childhood, particularly by attending to the surroundings, and guarding the susceptible infant against improper influences; but, in subsequent training, he places undue weight upon the cultivation of memory, and leans strongly to the cramming method of teaching.

Among the Roman writers on educational subjects, in the Christian era, Seneca and Quintilian occupy the highest rank, although their pedagogic wisdom, too, lies scattered in a mass of ideas on other subjects, and never rises to the dignity of an educational system. Seneca was born two years B. C., at Cordova, in Spain, and educated in Rome. In the course of time he became the teacher of young Nero, and withdrew afterward into private life, devoting himself to literary occupations. A. D. 65, he was accused of participation in a conspiracy and condemned to death.

Surrounded by the excesses of a corrupt society, he held that man was naturally inclined to evil, but that

wise laws and, particularly, a rational education, coupling strictness with mildness, could counteract the sinful tendencies and lead to virtue. He admonishes impressively against anger in punishment, and sums up his directions in this respect in the sentence: "Who condemns quickly, condemns passionately; who punishes too much, punishes unjustly." He recognizes the manifold differences in the individual character, in the dispositions and peculiarities of children, and insists upon the necessity of modifying the treatment of children in accordance with these differences. Disgusted with the sterile cramming of the memory that characterized his time, he contended for reduction and limitation of studies to that which was needed in life, and gave rise to the rule that "we must teach not for the school, but for life."

In moral education, he places great weight upon example and illustration as the mightiest factors; these may precede or follow precept, according to circumstances, but they are essential. "Long and tedious," he says, "is the road of precept, but short and efficacious that of example." He differs widely from Cicero in the place which he assigns to the study of nature. He holds that only insight into the laws of nature enables us to approach the Deity, as it were, and to regulate our lives in accordance with his will; for wisdom, he says, consists in strict adherence to the known laws of nature, in following her example freely and from conviction. Physical exercise he deems useful, if carried on with moderation; but injurious, exhausting body and mind, if indulged in to excess. He, too, acknowledges the importance of early training, and extols the

calling of the teacher who leads youth in the path of truth.

Quintilian was born A. D. 42, in Spain. He, too, received his education in Rome, where he became one of the most eminent orators. He became a public teacher of eloquence, and was so successful that he obtained from the emperor Vespasian the consular dignity and a considerable salary. He was the first teacher salaried by the state, and was distinguished by the title, *Professor of Eloquence.* After the death of his wife and of one of his two sons, he retired into private life, in order to devote himself to the education of his remaining son, and wrote in his retirement his leading work, the *Institutions of Oratory*, which also contains his principles of general education.

Quintilian has a very favorable opinion of the powers of children. He thinks that weak-minded children and children that can not learn are very rare; that, on the contrary, man has natural talents, a natural disposition to learn as the bird has to fly; and that a good education always yields good fruit. He holds that intellectual culture should begin long before the seventh year; not that the children should be forced to systematic, persistent work, but that their plays should be managed so as to develop their intellects. Hence, in the choice of the nurses, great care should be taken to choose well-educated women, with correct pronunciation and of excellent moral character. Similar care should be bestowed on the choice of associates and, again, of the first teachers or pedagogues. Of these he does not ask that they should be learned; but he insists that they should be able to direct the first instruction in lan-

guage; and, above all things, if they are not learned, that they should be aware of it. He is quite positive that it is a grave error to think that an inferior teacher is good enough for the beginning, because the children will subsequently have the double task of unlearning what the inferior teacher taught them, and of acquiring new things. But even the most skillful teacher, he thinks, is a curse, if he is not a noble, pure man.

He considers it the first and foremost duty of the teacher to render himself familiar with the individual peculiarities of the pupil. He condemns the practice of asking more from a pupil than he can do understandingly. In discipline he favors mildness, and is altogether opposed to corporal punishment, upon which he looks as a sign of negligence and indolence in the teacher. In addition, the teacher should be on a friendly footing with the parents of the pupil; should consider himself, for the time, the substitute of the father; should be free from faults, control his anger, be moderate in praise and blame, always just, and an example of all that is good. He warmly prefers school instruction to instruction in the family, because the latter does not fit for the vicissitudes of life in society; because it produces self-conceit and fails to produce self-control.

Thus, while we fail to discover in the Roman writers a harmonious system of education, similar to those of their Greek teachers; while we fail to find in them the lofty ideals of a Socrates and of an Aristotle, they furnish us a rich mine of practical suggestions, so strictly in accordance with common sense and with correct principles of humanity, that to follow them is to be in the path of truth.

LECTURE V.

CHRISTIANITY — THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY — BACON — COMENIUS.

During the reign of Emperor Augustus, about four years before the beginning of the Christian era, there was born in Galilee a man who by many of his followers is not inappropriately named *The Man*. While Roman civilization, which at that time overshadowed the world, was hastening to its death, he founded a new religion, and with it a new civilization, based on pure humanity; a religion and a civilization which will ever rise superior to the persecutions of its enemies, and to the abuses and perversions of its pretended friends; a religion and a civilization which, deeply and firmly rooted in truth, must henceforth live and grow, even if it should lose its name.

Christianity, opposed to all external distinctions among men — not excluding the distinction of sex — recognized in man only the human being, a being endowed with unlimited perfectibility; and would lead its followers to the love of God and of fellow-beings, to individual and social virtue. "Be perfect, even as your

Father in heaven is perfect," is the watchword of this new civilization: *i. e.*, be all that your powers enable you to be; live, grow, do; avoid stagnation as you would death; seek progress as you would life. In the proportion in which the human being perfects himself, makes all the use he can of his talents—no matter how limited they are — Christianity approves or disapproves, rewards or punishes; the greatest is not he who has most, but he who does most.

Thus, Christianity addressed itself to all who suffered from oppression, whatever its nature; it offered to all that were "heavy-laden" a haven of "rest," where there is no superiority of nation, of caste, of rank, of birth, of wealth, of knowledge, or of sex; where even the helpless infant is safe from cruelty and violence. On this account it spread with amazing rapidity as soon as the oppressed masses had realized the nature of the call, braving persecution and death, compelling, at last, even its enemies to acknowledge the truth and force of its teachings, and creating mighty revolutions in all relations of life.

But this rapid diffusion was not without its evil results: few apprehended the new religion in its fullness and beauty; many adopted it from policy, and perverted its teachings to personal advantages; many were drowned in its vast ideality, and sought virtue in entire abnegation, in absolute contempt of real life; ignorance, selfishness, and fanaticism robbed it more and more of its purely humane character; and Christian education, whose aim had been the humanizing of mankind, retrograded into a specific education, whose highest aim was the production of believers in Christianity, or,

rather, of believers in a variety of dogmas that grew upon the new religion as the mistletoe grows upon the oak.

To review the multitude of phases through which the specific Christian education passed, variously influenced by monasticism, scholasticism, and a number of other factors, would lead me too far astray from the ultimate object of my lectures. The study of the period during which the seeds of truth in the religion of humanity lived and even grew, in spite of all kinds of hostile agencies, is indeed very gratifying to the philanthropist and to the Christian; but it is our business to hasten to the time when philosophy and science succeeded in coming to the rescue, and to sketch the lives and works of a few eminent men whose labors culminated in the new developing education; and this brings us to the close of the sixteenth century and, first, to Lord Bacon.

Lord Bacon was born in the year 1561, in London, and died in 1626. His eloquence and learning had enabled him to climb to the highest positions of public trust; yet his official career has little to please, much to mortify, since it appears that his moral character was quite reprehensible. On the other hand, he has conferred incalculable blessings on mankind by freeing it from the fetters of scholastic word-wisdom, from the slavery of tradition and authority; by recalling it from the sterile plains of an excessive idealism on which it had starved, and leading it back to the rich fields of nature; by showing mankind the road to the philosophy and science of humanity, the great safeguards of the religion of humanity.

Lord Bacon was no teacher, nor did he directly exert

any influence upon education; but he gave to mankind new ways and new aims of thought, which, in the course of time, modified the whole intellectual and ethical life of the race. He rejected the scholastic, abstract method of antiquity, and insisted upon independent investigation of concrete reality; he wanted science to become intuitional, living, and practical; it must investigate the world, in order to control it and make it subservient to our wants and happiness.

He holds that scientific life does not consist in the learning of traditional lore, but in independent investigation, in discovery and invention. Hence he finds the only correct method of study in experience, in observation and experiment, with the accompanying comparisons, applications, and generalizations. The student must rise from carefully observed and digested facts to accurate conceptions, from the phenomenon to the law of being and to the rule of action. Hence Lord Bacon's method has been called the method of induction — not the induction of mere analysis, taught by Aristotle, but the induction of synthesis, of discovery and invention. In order to do full justice to this method of thought, it is necessary to give up all prejudices, or "idols," as Lord Bacon calls them, whether they arise from insufficient powers of insight, from haste, from personal temperament, from education and caste, from manners, customs, and laws of the community, or from a belief in the authority of tradition; perception and reason must be perfectly free and untrammeled.

I hope to show in the sequel the vast influence of this new philosophy upon education, more particularly upon intellectual culture; an influence which, in the

words of Von Raumer, at the distance of more than two centuries, is still in the ascendant. But there are in his works many passages that have a direct bearing on education, of which I offer a few by way of illustrating his views on the subject. He gives preference to the genetic method of teaching, where the teacher "transplants knowledge into the scholar's mind as it grew in his own;" for "whatever is imparted in this way will take root, flourish, and bear fruit." However, he believes that "methods should vary according to the subject taught, for in knowledge itself there is great diversity."

In another place he pleads for the importance of education. "A gardener," he says, "takes more pains with the young than with the full-grown plant; and men commonly find it needful, in any undertaking, to begin well. We give scarce a thought to our teachers, and care little for what they may be, and yet we are forever complaining because rulers are rigid in the matter of laws and penalties, but indifferent to the right training of the young."

The beneficial influence of Lord Bacon's philosophy upon pedagogy is illustrated most conspicuously and most beautifully in the last bishop of the Bohemian Brothers, John Amos Comenius. He was born in the year 1592, at Comnia, in Moravia. His early history is obscure; it is known, however, that he attended the university of Herborn, at Nassau, where he studied theology. In 1614, he returned to his native land and became rector of a school, and, in 1618, pastor of a parish of Bohemian Brothers. In 1624, Ferdinand II. banished all evangelical preachers from his realms, and Comenius

took refuge at Lissa, in Poland, where he became, in 1628, member of the faculty of the academy. Here he completed his first didactic works of importance, among which the "*Key to the Study of Languages*" founded his reputation. It appeared in 1631, and was received with such immense applause that in a short time it was translated into twelve European and several Asiatic languages. In 1641, he accepted a call of the English Parliament to visit England, and to reform the English schools according to his principles; but civil war neutralized his efforts, and he yielded to a similar call from Sweden, in 1642, where he was more successful. Soon afterward he returned to Lissa, where he was made a bishop of his church in 1648. In 1650, he accepted the call of a Hungarian prince, to assist in the reorganization of schools, but returned to Lissa four years later. In 1652, the Poles burned Lissa and scattered the Bohemian Brothers forever. His subsequent wanderings brought him to Amsterdam, where he was cordially received. He died at Naarden, a neighboring town, in 1671. During his stay in Hungary he had composed a remarkable school-book, entitled the "*Orbis Pictus*," which I shall have occasion to mention again hereafter.

Comenius was by no means one of those pedagogues who take up one or another single subject of instruction, or who place all good in a certain method of teaching. He was, in the very best sense of the word, universal; and notwithstanding this universality, he always strove after the most thorough foundation. The aim of education he finds in wisdom, in knowledge, virtue, and piety. He contended that all men need instruction; that all children, rich and poor, high and low, boys and girls,

should be taught in school. "Not," he adds, "that each should learn every science; but all should be so instructed that they may understand the basis, relation, and purpose of all the most important things, having reference to what they are and are to become." He complained that the educational systems of his time did not accomplish this. In many places there were no schools at all, and in others only the children of the wealthy were cared for. At the same time, he condemns the methods of instruction as repulsive, tedious, and misty; and deplores the neglect of moral training, the absence of sciences in the curriculum, and the undue preponderance of Latin.

He proposed a system of educational institutions, consisting of four divisions: the maternal school, the vernacular school, the Latin school, and the academy.

The maternal school comprises domestic education under the mother's direction, and lasts during the first six years of the child's life. Its main care is the sound mind in the sound body. The mother must attend with intelligent solicitude to the physical welfare of her child; she must nurse it herself; guard it from all stimulants and quackery; offer it opportunities for cheerful play, for manifold observations, accompanied with simple instructions; and implant the seeds of virtue and piety.

He shows ingeniously how, already during the first six years of life, the child can and should obtain in the parental home the elements of all later knowledge. He shows how from the cradle it gradually extends the scope of its perceptions to the sitting-room, the other rooms of the house, the yard, the streets, the gardens and fields, to sun, moon, and stars; how it becomes

familiar with its limbs and their uses, with animals, plants, stones, and their names; how it learns to distinguish light from darkness, day from night, colors, shapes, numbers, and sounds; how it gains ideas of longer and shorter periods of time, of the development of organic life, of human institutions; how it becomes skilled in song, language, and gestures. In short, Comenius sketches an elementary course of object lessons, of exercises in intuition, in thinking and speaking, and shows that it contains the principles of all subsequent instruction in geography, natural science, geometry, arithmetic, music, language, etc. At the same time, parents should, particularly by example, develop correct moral feelings, and lead their children to moderation, cleanliness, obedience, and modesty.

When the child is ready for the vernacular school, the latter should present itself in a friendly, not in a repulsive light. The vernacular school, similar to our district school, furnishes instruction to the child from the sixth to the twelfth year. Comenius asks that it should teach only the vernacular language (hence its name), and that it should lay great stress upon practical education. Reading, writing, orthography, arithmetic, measuring, song, religion, the elements of history, natural science, geography and astronomy, popular instruction about trades and arts, should constitute the curriculum of exercise and study. Thus, he would make the vernacular school an institution that prepares for life as well as for the higher institutions of learning.

With reference to the latter, I would merely state that Comenius lays down for them, among others, these principles: without knowledge, rational thought, speech,

and action are impossible, hence the sciences must be nurtured; avoid words without ideas; let the concrete always precede the abstract. To deal more largely with these higher institutions does not lie within our limits, and I return to his views on elementary instruction.

School, he says, is a workshop of humanity; it is to bring man to the ready and proper use of his reason, his language, and his artistic skill — to wisdom, eloquence, and prudence. Hence, its material of instruction must be valuable and comprehensible for all the children of the people, and must tend to their universal cultivation. Whatever bears no fruit in life nor enhances humanity, whatever tends to empty words and shallow mechanical drilling, is not for the school. The material of instruction must be selected with care, and treated in accordance with natural methods that agree with the normal development of children and take into consideration their manifold individual peculiarities. First, the senses are to be set to work; then, memory; and, at last, understanding and judgment. The pupil must not learn by heart what has not become his from perception or reflection; he must not speak about what he does not understand. The thing must precede the word; the example must come before the rule In all branches, the easy and the simple thing must come before the difficult and the complex. Nor should the child receive much or many things at once, but progress gradually and continuously.

Thus, the clear mind of Comenius was already fully aware of the methodical laws which require that all instruction should be based on intuition, should be gradual, thorough, and continuous; but it was no less

evident to him that all instruction must arouse and enhance the self-activity of the learner. The child, he claims, must use its senses as perceptive powers; must observe surrounding objects; compare its perceptions; form concepts, judgments, conclusions from its ideas; learn to express its thoughts clearly and fluently; and fix its knowledge, as well as improve its skill, by varied practice. In short, all the powers of the pupil must be kept in activity. Knowledge must not be given to the pupil as something finished, as something ready-made or cut-and-dried, but it must be found from its elements; or, as Comenius expresses himself, "the teacher must not sow plants instead of seeds."

Wheresoever circumstances permit it, Comenius would lead the pupils to obtain their fundamental ideas, at least, from the direct observation of objects, or, in the absence of these, from the pictures of objects. In order to supply such pictures, and in order to fix and arrange the ideas gained by the child, he composed a book, "The *Orbis Pictus*, the Visible World; that is, the Pictures and Names of all the Principal Things in the World, and of all the Principal Occupations of Man." In spite of its many faults in technical execution and arrangement, this remarkable book exerted a wonderful influence upon the schools, and did much to diffuse more rational views upon education.

While Comenius thus gave clear directions concerning methods of instruction, he never lost sight of the disciplinary and pedagogic side of the school. He insists repeatedly that the school is not only to impart knowledge and skill, but that it must, at the same time, diffuse virtue and piety, and develop as well as

strengthen perseverance, punctuality, orderliness, justice, etc. He asks for airy and light school-rooms, and considers play-grounds essential to a well-regulated school. At the same time, he deems frequent walks with the classes absolutely necessary, to render the children familiar with nature and human occupations. In short, Comenius aims not at intellectual culture alone, but at a harmonious development of the entire human being. He is a pedagogue in the fullest sense of the word.

LECTURE VI.

LOCKE — FRANCKE.

I TURN again to England for the representative of the next great forward step in science and philosophy, and, consequently, in the theory and practice of education. This benefactor of the race is John Locke. He was born in the year 1632, received his education at Westminster and Oxford, and died in the year 1704 after a life remarkable for strange vicissitudes, but yet more for unsullied purity and intense piety.

Bacon had led the way to inductive investigation with reference to external nature; Locke applied the same principles to the study of the internal — of the mental nature of man — and laid down the results of his labors in his "*Essay on Human Understanding.*" Thus he became the founder of empirical psychology, so important in modern pedagogy. More particularly, he established the important doctrine that there are no innate principles in the mind, and that all ideas come from sensation or reflection, from external or internal experience or observation.

His ideas on the subject of education are laid down in a book, entitled "*Thoughts on Education*," of whose

contents I give a short abstract. He defines his ideal of education, at the outset, in the following words: "A sound mind in a sound body, is a short but full description of a happy state in this world. He that has these two, has little more to wish for; and he that wants either of them, will be little the better for any thing else." He then gives, in the first place, a comprehensive treatise on the hygienic treatment of children. He asks that the food be plain and simple, and free from excessive or high seasoning; that the clothing should be light and comfortable. In this connection, I can not refrain from giving you in full his concluding remark on lacing. He says: "And yet I have seen so many instances of children receiving great harm from strait lacing, that I can not but conclude there are other creatures as well as monkeys, who, little wiser than they, destroy their young ones by senseless fondness and too much embracing." Again, he insists upon frequent and prolonged stay in the open air, upon diligent bathing and swimming, upon thorough hardening of the body, upon regular sleep on a cool and hard bed, and upon a limited use of physic. "It is safer," he says, "to leave the children wholly to nature than to put them in the hands of one forward to tamper, or that thinks children are to be cured, in ordinary distempers, by any thing but diet, or by a method very little distant from it."

It is by no means the smallest merit of Locke to have presented the hygienic treatment of children in a more thorough, more systematic, and more scientific manner than any of his predecessors had done. He inaugurated thereby a reform which did good work, as we shall see

directly, in the schools of the pietists and, more yet, in those of the philanthropinists of Germany, and which is bearing delightful fruit even to-day.

Locke's ideas on discipline are almost equally excellent. "As the strength of the body," he says, "lies chiefly in being able to endure hardships, so also does that of the mind. And the great principle and foundation of all virtue and worth is placed in this, that a man is able to deny himself his own desires, cross his own inclinations, and purely follow what reason directs as best, though the appetite lean the other way." He holds that this training in self-denial and self-control can not begin too early, and that a sturdy fight must be made from earliest childhood with all kinds of ill habits and ill humors, however slight they may seem. He places great stress upon the development of truthfulness and of a proper sense of honor; although it would seem to me that he errs in making ambition and the love of applause one of the most important incentives of the mind.

He looks upon the rod — which he calls the instrument of the "usual lazy and short-way chastisement" — as the most unfit means of any to be used in education; because it accustoms the child to act less from reason than from fear of pain, and because it abases and breaks the spirit. Only in extreme cases of malice, stubbornness, and lying, he is willing to admit the rod as a corrective; though it seems difficult to see how an instrument so pernicious can work any good, even in these cases, unless we are willing to grant that malice, stubbornness, and lying can be cured by that which produces these disorders.

Unlike Quintilian of old, he is in favor of private, domestic education in preference to the public school; a view for which he deserves credit, when we consider the miserable condition of the public schools of his time in methods of instruction and discipline, as well as in materials of instruction; and if we oppose to them, as Locke does, an excellent mother and an excellent governor. In all cases, however, he is opposed to a multiplicity of rules. "Make but few laws," he says; "but see that they be well observed when once made."

Speaking of learning, he begins: "You will wonder, perhaps, that I put learning last, especially if I tell you that I think it the least part." He deems learning indeed necessary, but not the chief business of education; inferior to health, virtue, and wisdom. He deems learning a great help to virtue and wisdom in well-disposed minds; but in others not so disposed, he contends that "it helps them only to be the more foolish and worse men." He would have children learn without compulsion, of their own free will and accord; and he considers it the main business of the educator to render learning easy and pleasant.

He advises to teach children reading as soon as they can speak, but without compulsion; in play, as it were, by means of alphabet blocks, for instance. As reading books, he commends *Æsop's Fables*, with as many pictures as possible, also *Reynard, the Fox*. Writing is commenced as soon as the children can read, by methods that deserve little notice. Afterward, drawing is taken up, and great attention is paid to it on account of its practical value. Language he would have taught on

the plan of Comenius, *i. e.*, based on practice, and in connection with scientific instruction. Arithmetic, book-keeping, and practical scientific branches are considered of special importance; on the other hand, poetry, music, and the arts in general, find little favor in his eyes. Only dancing is admitted, because it gives graceful manners; and, for "gentlemen," fencing and riding are added.

Indeed, Locke's "*Thoughts on Education*" have throughout special reference to the training of young noblemen, since his position, as tutor in a noble family, gave rise to the treatise. While they, therefore, contain many valuable thoughts, they do not contain any thing about the arrangement of public institutions, education of girls, etc., and have no claim as a system of universal education.

To this, without doubt, it is due that the direct and immediate influence of Locke's views upon education was not remarkable. Formalism and scholasticism continued to rule the schools where they existed. It was reserved for the pietists, the followers of a reformatory religious direction in Germany, to give practical life to his views, inasmuch as he asked for greater attention to physical education; inasmuch as he deemed moral and intellectual development superior to mere learning; and inasmuch as he called for branches of instruction that have a bearing upon real life. To this the pietists added an intensely Christian tendency and, above all things, an earnest effort to confer the blessings of education equally upon all, the rich and the poor, the high and the low, the boys and the girls.

Similar to the Puritans of England at an earlier, and to the Methodists at a later date, the pietists made war upon the dogmatism of an established church and upon the aristocratic isolation of the schools, and struggled for active and general diffusion of practical Christianity and for the popularizing of education. The founder of pietism was Phil. Jacob Spener, who occupied high clerical positions at Dresden and Berlin from 1686 to 1705.

The pedagogic representative of pietism is Augustus Hermann Francke, a man whose labors in the cause of education are so intimately interwoven with his life, that to sketch the one is to sketch the other. Francke was born at Lubeck, in 1663; in 1666, his father removed to Gotha, but died four years later. The orphan boy attended the gymnasium of Gotha with such remarkable success that he was declared ready to graduate in his fourteenth year. However, he did not go to the university until two years later. He studied theology diligently and successively at Erfurt, Kiel, Hamburg, and Leipzig, where he took his degree.

The important event that finally determined the tendency of his life overtook him at Hamburg, where he established an infant school in 1687. "Upon the establishment of this school," he says, "I learned how destructive the usual school management is, and how exceedingly difficult the discipline of children; and this reflection made me desire that God would make me worthy to do something for the improvement of schools and instruction." He published the results of his experience in a work, entitled "*The Education of Children to Piety and Christian Wisdom.*"

In 1691, the university of Halle was founded, and, through Spener's influenee, Franeke was appointed professor of Greek and Oriental languages in the new university, and, at the same time, pastor of the suburb Glaueha.

The opening of the year 1694 is to be considered as the beginning of all the great institutions of Francke. They commenced as follows: the poor were aceustomed to eome to the parsonage every Thursday for alms. Instead of giving them bread before the door, Franeke ealled them into the house, catechized the younger in the hearing of the elder, and elosed with a prayer. In his own poverty, he began to lay by money for the poor by depriving himself for a long time of his supper. In 1695, he fixed a poor-box in his room; in this he found, one day, seven florins, left by a benevolent lady. "This is a handsome eapital," he said, on taking it out; "I must found a good institution with this; I shall found a sehool for the poor." On the same day, he bought some books and employed a poor student to teaeh the children two hours daily. Soon the ehildren of some eitizens began to attend, and paid a small tuition fee, so that the teaeher was better paid and was enabled to teaeh five hours daily.

During the first summer the attendance had reached sixty. At the same time, the reputation of his benevolence and piety procured him eontributions from every quarter, so that he was encouraged to rent a room in a neighboring house, to employ an additional teacher, and to separate the poor school from the citizen (or burgher) school.

In 1695, he formed the plan of establishing an orphan

asylum. Immediately he took a number of orphans to his school, and boarded them at the houses of benevolent citizens; but a present of five hundred thalers from a friend enabled him soon afterward to buy a house and to establish an orphan asylum. In the same year, three boys, the sons of noble families, were intrusted to him, to be educated under his care, giving rise to the foundation of the present pedagogium, which was reserved for the sons of the nobility.

In 1696, he bought a second house for his orphans; and, in June of that year, the number of orphans had increased to fifty-two, so that he concluded to build a more extensive asylum, the corner-stone of which was laid two years later. In the same year, he established a free table for poor students. In 1697, he founded, in addition to the vernacular school, a Latin school, which differed from the gymnasia of his time in paying more attention to scientific branches. In 1707, he established a sort of teachers' seminary, in which he gave to students free instruction and opportunity for practice, as well as free board, for two years, on condition that, after the completion of their course, they would teach or be otherwise useful in his institutions for three years. And thus he went on, founding institution upon institution, adding building to building, until his death in the year 1727.

This is the report, made to the king, of the status of his creations at the time of his death: 1. The pedagogium, 82 pupils, with 70 teachers and attendants; 2. The Latin school, with 3 inspectors, 32 teachers, 400 pupils and attendants; 3. The vernacular schools, with 4 inspectors, 98 male and 8 female teachers, and

1,725 boys and girls; 4. Orphan asylum, with 100 boys, 34 girls, and 10 attendants; 5. Free boarders, 225 students and 360 poor scholars; 6. Household, apothecary's store, and book store, 53 attendants; 7. Institutions for females — 15 in the college for young ladies, 6 in the widows' asylum.

In 1863, these institutions, having continued to flourish under state control after the death of Francke, represented in real-estate the value of 313,266 thalers; since their foundation, more than 10,000 teachers had instructed in them, and they had given an education to nearly 250,000 boys and girls.

From all this it is evident that Francke was truly and seriously in earnest in his efforts in behalf of schools and education. In practical achievements, in organizing and administrative talent, he surpasses all pedagogues and educationists that have preceded or followed him. His whole learning, his whole energy, his whole life, his whole happiness were in the cause; and his success, when we take into consideration the period he blessed with his labors, is truly astounding.

He was one of the first who saw clearly how much the teacher needed professional training, and he was singularly successful in securing it for his teachers. He laid great stress upon systematic order and method in instruction and discipline — too much, it is true, for his immediate followers, who lacked his genius, and in whose hands they degenerated into mechanism of the worst sort. The study and consideration of individual propensities and powers was one of his main concerns, and it frequently happened that his pupils were in as many different classes as they followed studies. He is

concerned for the physical well-being of his pupils, and insists upon airy and high school-rooms and sleeping-rooms, as well as upon wholesome diet and exercise. He is in favor of intuitional teaching, and provides an abundance of apparatus and other appliances in accordance with his views. In discipline he is full of love and kindness, yet inflexibly strict.

He defines his aim of education as "godliness and prudence." The first expression is equivalent with piety, as it was in the mind of the founder of his sect — the sum and substance of Christian virtues — and in *his* mind, again, the sum and substance of human virtues. With Locke, he regarded this of incalculably more importance than mere learning. "One grain of living faith," he exclaims, in his unbounded enthusiasm, "is more to be valued than a hundred-weight of mere historical knowledge; and one drop of true love is more valuable than an ocean of learning in all the mysteries." Unfortunately, in this, too, his followers caught only the words and failed to be inspired with the spirit, so that they came very near converting into a curse to humanity the very things with which he meant to bless and did bless mankind.

By the word "prudence" he designated the practical side of education. This was particularly manifest in the great attention which he paid to scientific and technical instruction. There were not only extensive botanical gardens, cabinets of natural history, dissecting-rooms, and laboratories connected with his institutions, but turning-lathes, mills for grinding glass, painters' tools, and other opportunities for practice in technical skill.

Thus, he became virtually the founder of the scientific schools of Germany — the *Real schulen* — which have contributed so much to the development of technical talent and scientific progress in Germany, as well as to the subjugation of natural forces and to the consequent emancipation of the race. Thus, he outlived even the perversions to which his immediate followers had subjected his work, and fully realized his motto: "They who wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles."

LECTURE VII.

ROUSSEAU.

In the last two lectures I sketched a few types of the philosophers and schoolmen of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, engaged in developing aims that culminated in the schools of the *humanists* and *realists*. Both aimed at the development of individuality and of a sense and appreciation of humanity; both educated for life upon this earth, human or real life, in opposition to the excessively religious tendency of the orthodox schools of the time, which looked upon life on earth as a transitional state whose only value lay in preparation for a future existence. They differed, however, in their means: the *humanists* laid almost exclusive stress upon the Latin and the Greek languages, rhetoric, poetry, and classical antiquities — or upon the so-called "humanities"; while the *realists* found their arcana in the "knowledge which is most worth" — in mathematics, physics, history, geography, and the modern languages.

In the eighteenth century, Rousseau, the greatest of realists, opened the way for entirely new aims in education by what has been called "a return to nature."

This expression must not, however, be understood to mean that the celebrated French philosopher returned to a natural system that had previously been followed. While the human being, previous to the humanists and realists, had been looked upon as a more or less preternatural existence — a being not fully subject to the ordinary laws of organic growth and development — and the human mind, at best, as something to be filled, Rousseau wanted man to be looked upon as an organism, and asked that education should be an independent development of the nature of this organism. In order to accomplish this, he required an absolute return to what he called the natural state of man; that is, the young must be educated independent of civil relations, current prejudices, dogmatic authority, etc.; and the aim of the educator must be to produce an absolutely independent human being — fitted, however, to become a member of society — with powers strengthened by individual effort, with convictions and a will dependent only on reason, and free from the passions and prejudices of men.

Individuality, independence, strength of character, nature, reason, are the watchwords of Rousseau's educational system; but it had to be greatly modified, freed from a host of fallacies, vaguenesses, eccentricities, and morbid sentimentalities; a great number of insufficiencies had to be supplied; the nature of man had to be more carefully and more fully set forth, before it could bring good to mankind. Still, in spite of its faults, it contains the germs of our present developing education, and Rousseau is justly termed its father.

Rousseau was not a practical educator; he was exclusively a theorist: he did very little; he only thought:

hence his impractical eccentricities. Hence, too, his life is of little importance to us; for in it we find nothing to imitate and, as far as educational practice is concerned, nothing to shun. He was born in the year 1712, at Geneva, in Switzerland. At the same time his mother died — his first misfortune, as he justly terms it. His father, a watch-maker, was a man without character, and had little influence upon his education. After a life full of strange vicissitudes and strangely stained with shameful errors, but full, too, of the noblest aspirations and of the purest and most generous philanthropy, he died at Ermenonville, near Paris, in 1778, and found a resting-place in the Pantheon in the year 1794.

His ideas on the subject of education are laid down in the celebrated work entitled "*Emile, or Education*," which appeared in 1762. It consists of five books, of which the first treats of the management of new-born children, and more particularly of Emile up to the time when he learned to talk, or to his second year of life. The second book brings him to his twelfth year; the third book, to his fifteenth; the fourth, to his marriage with Sophia, whose education forms the burden of the fifth book. Thus, he divides education, first, into boys' and girls' education, but devotes much more attention to the former than to the latter.

In general, Rousseau starts with an utter horror of the civilization of his time; and would, therefore, keep the boy entirely aloof from this civilization, guard him against all its influences, return him to what he calls the state of nature, and leave him to his normal talents, wants, and inclinations. "All is good," he exclaims, "as it comes from the hands of the Creator: all degen-

erates under the hands of man." Hence he calls his system, in which he claims to follow the plans of the Creator, nature's course of development. Education, he says, is threefold: man is educated by nature, by other men, by things. The inner development of our powers and organs is the education of nature; the use we are taught to make of this development, is the education by men; and what we learn by direct experience, from surrounding circumstances, is education by things. The first of these we have not in our power; hence, the remaining two must be shaped in accordance with it, if we would have harmonious culture. His Emile, who is to be thus naturally and harmoniously educated, is rich, healthy, vigorous, an orphan, and inhabits a temperate climate — circumstances which, indeed, are not necessarily natural or co-existent, but which enable Rousseau to place Emile in the hands of an excellent tutor, and to bring to bear upon him educational influences, free from all kinds of prejudices, preconceived notions, and conventional ties.

Of this tutor Rousseau asks that he educate Emile for a man — a human being — for the common human vocation, and not for any special calling, not even for citizenship. His highest guiding principle must be, in whatever he does, to educate according to nature, *i. e.*, in accordance with the nature of the boy, with his talents, powers, wants, individual peculiarities — in accordance with the rights and the welfare of the child. In no case must the tutor allow himself to be guided by arbitrary laws, fashionable follies, or thoughtless, servile obedience to temporary customs, notions, and tendencies. "Nature," he says, "creates neither princes, nor nobles, nor states-

men. If you educate the pupil exclusively for a certain position, you make him unfit for every other. Whether my pupil is destined for war, for the church, or for the bench, is of little concern to me. To live, life, is the calling which he is to learn from me. When I shall be done with him, he will be neither statesman, nor soldier, nor priest; he will be a human being — a man. Natural education must fit man for all human relations." Again, speaking of the importance of studying the child's nature, he exclaims: "They do not know the nature of the child; in consequence of the false notions that lead them, they go further astray the further they progress. Even the most reasonable are guided by what is suitable for men of science, without considering what the children can comprehend. They always seek the man in the boy, without reflecting what he is before he is a man. Begin, therefore, with the study of your pupils." If Rousseau had done nothing else than to enounce and establish these anthropological principles of education, he would have done enough to entitle himself to the gratitude of succeeding generations.

On the basis of these principles he builds his system of education. In this, physical education occupies a prominent place. His rules coincide mostly with those of Locke, whose "*Thoughts on Education*" he knew and esteemed very highly. He holds that physical is intimately connected with moral education; and he looks upon bodily weakness and infirmity as a source of moral indisposition and as a great danger to character, while health and vigor give mental serenity and impart strength to the will.

He maintains that there is no original depravity in

the human heart; that there is not a single vice in the heart which has not come from without. Hence, early education should be mostly negative; it should consist in keeping the heart free from vice and the understanding free from error. He would satisfy the natural wants of the child readily, yet within strict limits of necessity and wholesomeness. He is opposed to every sort of unnatural restraint and tyranny, as well as to all premature moralizing; on the other hand, he would guard with equal zeal against every thing that tends to enervation, against all superfluous assistance, against the pampering of whimsical appetites, against whatever might mislead the child into hypocrisy, cunning, or falsehood in word or deed.

The child must learn to adapt itself to circumstances; must learn to submit to physical necessity; must be led gradually to correct ideas, sentiments, inclinations, and actions by actual relations of life. Its own experience must teach it how to distinguish the useful from the injurious; must make it prudent, a lover of the good.

About the fifteenth year of his life, Emile is introduced to society, where he may become attached to others, learn to respect and love his equals. Heretofore he has felt, striven, acted for himself in rural seclusion; now it is time that he should learn to feel, strive, and act for others — should fit himself for society. Rousseau contends that he does this under unusually favorable circumstances; that envy, hatred, jealousy, and malice have found no room in his heart, because he had no opportunity to compare himself with any one else; because no one had stood in his way, and the vices of society could exercise no influence over him. He has

strengthened and exercised his eyes in order to see correctly; his heart, in order to feel correctly. He is controlled by no authority but that of reason. He is ready to distinguish, in social life, appearance from reality, evil from good; he is ready to appreciate the degenerating influence of civilization, to esteem human worth, to pity the degenerate race, to help and serve his neighbor, to love his native land, to aid public welfare; in short, to become a humane and moral, a useful and happy member of society.

For intellectual culture, Rousseau demands clearly and decisively all the principles which, through and since Pestalozzi, have become the guiding-stars of education: training of the senses; self-activity; organic development; continuity; evolution of the powers; lively interest. He makes war upon mechanical training, cramming, over-work, superficiality, and precocity; and condemns words without thoughts, as well as symbols without things. Even with reference to the teaching of various branches of instruction, he is fully up to, nay, in advance of our time.

He asks that geography should begin with the house and place of abode, and points with bitter humor to a manual whose first question was, "What is the world?" and to an answer once given, "A ball of pasteboard." Home geography should be the starting-point; the pupil should draw maps of the neighborhood, in order to learn how maps are made and what they show.

Instruction in physics he would begin with the simplest experiments, illustrating the most common and obvious phenomena; and he would have teacher and pupil construct the instruments used. Yet he would

have the experiments form a chain, by the aid of which they may be better retained in the memory; for facts and demonstrations entirely isolated do not remain there.

He would not introduce, before the age of fifteen, any branches of speculative knowledge, or any that refer to social relations, or are based upon reflection, such as knowledge of men, history, politics, morals, religion, etc.; because, before this age, there are no independent starting-points in the child's mind; because, before this time, the pupil is not ready, not ripe for these branches.

Even reading and writing should not be undertaken with Emile before his twelfth year, since, up to this age, his time is entirely taken up with the study of the book of nature, with the collection of experiences and ideas, through the medium of his own senses, at the hand of his tutor. And when he can read, his first and, up to his fifteenth year, his only reading book is Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe.* "From books," he says, "men learn to talk about what they do not understand; but there is one book which may be considered as a most valuable treatise upon natural education; a book which might, for a long time, constitute the entire library of the pupil, namely, *Robinson Crusoe.* Robinson, alone upon an island, obliged to make every thing necessary to himself, becomes the boy's ideal; he will ask only for what would be necessary for him upon a Robinson's island."

On the other hand, he would have the tutor visit workshops with his pupil, so that the latter may learn to esteem and appreciate rightly the dignity and value

of human labor; and he would have Emile himself learn some respectable trade — for instance, that of a carpenter — in order to cure him of the then current prejudices against trades. "For," he exclaims prophetically (the book was written 1757), "we are approaching a crisis — the century of revolutions. It is impossible that the great monarchies of Europe can last long.... Happy will he be, then, who shall understand how to leave the condition which has left him, and to remain a man in spite of fate."

Æsthetic culture received as little favor in the eyes of Rousseau as it had received in those of his predecessor Locke; a position which is fully explained by his realistic tendency, by his indignation at the degeneracy of the arts, and by his excessive fear of precocity and pseudo-culture. He is poetically eloquent against eloquence and poetry, and demands clearness, simplicity, even coldness. Fables are wholly condemned by him; he contends that they are suitable only for men; that children must receive nothing but the "unadorned, naked truth."

Religious culture receives a great share of his attention. Yet, in accordance with his views on intellectual culture, it must be postponed, as far as religious ideas are concerned, to a late period. In his fifteenth year, Emile did not yet know that he had a soul, and Rousseau fears that he might find it out too soon in his eighteenth. For the period of education and, in this case, not before the fifteenth year, only natural religion is considered suitable. He would develop belief in God and immortality of the soul by means of contemplations of nature, of man, of virtue, of conscience, of fate, etc. He speaks

with the greatest enthusiasm of Christianity and opposes materialism.

Also, in the fifth book, discussing the education of Sophie, he treats religious culture with great consideration. But he asks that religion should never be made a matter of compulsion or sorrow, never a task or duty; and that the girls should more love than learn religion. Prayers should be said in their presence, but they should not be forced to learn these by heart. They should be accustomed to feel themselves constantly in the presence of God, and should devote their lives to a worship consisting in doing good. Their religion should be of the heart, not of the head.

Among the many faults and inconsistencies of Rousseau's system, whose chief features I have attempted to sketch, the most glaring are the entire absence of family training, the relatively inferior position assigned to the female sex, the almost exclusive reliance upon direct experience and negative education, and the excessive withholding of positive instruction in mental culture, the unreasonable and morbid hatred of society, and the extreme postponement of social education.

Among its many virtues, I would gratefully point out the enunciation of correct principles of intellectual culture, based upon the laws of organic development; and, above all, the establishment of the anthropological principles of education: the recognition of individual human worth as the highest criterion of excellence, the recognition of the fact that social excellence presupposes individual excellence, and the vindication of the rights and privileges of children. In the light of these great excellences, the faults of his system lose their pernicious

character to a great extent, and appear as salutary remedies directed against evils peculiar to the educational systems of his time. And his great work on education, "*Emile*," in spite of its one-sidedness, its Platonic ideality, its insufficiencies, is still, as Goethe terms it, the gospel of natural education, the germ that grew into the developing education of our days.

LECTURE VIII.

INFLUENCE OF MODERN PHILOSOPHERS: KANT — FICHTE — RICHTER — SCHOPENHAUER — HEGEL — ROSENKRANZ — HERBART — BENECKE — SPENCER.

THE work of polishing, preparing, and arranging the raw material furnished by the impetuous Rousseau, as far as the aims of education are concerned, was accomplished by philosophers like Kant, Fichte, Richter, Schopenhauer, Hegel, and Rosenkranz.

Kant maintains that the objects of education are threefold: moral, technical, and pragmatical. The moral object is the absolute one, and is attained in morality; the technical object, in skill; the pragmatical object, in prudence. Education must cultivate, civilize, moralize man. Children are to be educated not for the present, but for future generations, *i. e.*, in accordance with the ideal of mankind and of its destiny. Only on the basis of this principle, progress — a future better condition of mankind — is possible.

In addition to culture, education comprises sustenance (nursing, fostering), discipline, and instruction In sustenance, it is needful to follow nature as much as

possible, to keep children from injury and from a pernicious use of their powers. Discipline is to keep the child from losing its humanity by yielding to its animal appetites. Instruction must give the child knowledge and skill; it attends to physical development, but mainly to mental culture.

In education, it is all-important to establish always the true reasons, and to render them intelligible and agreeable to the child. The teacher must first make his pupil intelligent, then rational, then learned. The pupil must not learn thoughts, but he must learn to think; he must not be carried, but led, if we would make him independent. The lower faculties must be cultivated only with reference to the higher; for instance, memory, only with reference to the service it renders to intelligence. Virtue is not inborn, but acquired by instruction and practice.

Among the methods of instruction, he prefers, wherever it is practicable, the Socratic, heuristic, or developing method; for he says, "nothing is comprehended so fully and distinctly, nothing retained so firmly, as that which we find ourselves."

Fichte insists, if possible, still more strongly upon morality as the absolute aim of education, and lays very great stress upon freedom — independence from external motives. Only what is done from free determination, without the least external motive, is moral; hence the absurdity of using hope of rewards and fear of punishments as means to lead to virtue. Again, man is not alone in this world; he is a man among men, a member of a community of rational beings. As such, and only as such, he must be considered and educated up to

maturity, when he may choose his calling for life. All education for special callings or stations in life, before that time, he considers absurd and inhuman.

He contends that early education is, and can be, only in the hands of the parents, who, as a last resort in their efforts to lead the child to morality, may — nay, must — employ force. They should be careful, however, not to destroy free obedience, childlike regard for the superior goodness and wisdom of parents; and they should ever remain mindful of the fact that they are to bring up free human beings, and not machines devoid of a will. He designates as the representatives of education in the community, at a later period, the learned man who is to develop intelligence, free insight; the moral educator who is to develop that good-will, that character without which intelligence, free insight, has no value; and the æsthetic artist who, standing between the other two, must bring about a union between intelligence and will.

Richter is the apostle of ideal individuality. "Each one of us," he says, "has in himself his ideal prize man — that is, the harmonious maximum of all his individual predispositions; and it is the business of education to develop him into full growth." At the same time, he asks, with Kant, that education should elevate above the spirit of the times, and prepare for future generations. "A child," he exclaims, "should be more sacred to you than the present, which consists of things and adults. Through the child you move, although laboriously, by means of the shorter lever-arm of mankind, the longer one." Richter lays great stress on physical education; but he advises moderation, and is particular

to let physical exercise follow, not precede, intellectual effort.

Intellectual education, as well as the physical, he would begin at birth. Its element of life, as he calls it, he finds in cheerfulness. "Cheerfulness," he says, "is the sky under which every thing thrives, except poison. Cheerfulness is, at the same time, soil, flower, and wreath of virtue. What warmth is to the body, cheerfulness is to the soul." Hence, he attaches much importance to the plays of children. "Beasts," he says, "play only with the body; but children, with the soul." Still, here too, he counsels moderation, and warns against excess as highly pernicious. For the school, he gives no special directions.

His moral training is, even where he punishes, based upon the gentle rule of love. He dislikes precept, and relies upon example as the best teacher; for he says, "life is kindled only by life; hence, the highest in the child is aroused only by example." Thus, in every direction, he aims at the independent development of the ideal individuality in every child.

Schopenhauer lays great stress upon education for real life, upon the production of accurate understanding and of sound, untrammeled reason. He contends that all knowledge must have an intuitional basis, and that all abstract ideas must rest on concrete perceptions. He would offer to the young mind nothing that it can not master independently, for fear of creating error and prejudice. Artificial education, he says, consists in cramming the head with ideas, by means of teaching and reading, long before there are any direct perceptions in the mind of the learner. These perceptions are

expected to be supplied afterward by experience; but, up to this problematical time, the human being is left at the mercy of false impressions and of prejudice. This explains to him the fact that the learned are, as a general thing, less liberally gifted with common sense than the unlearned.

Hegel, too, considers pedagogy as the art of making man a moral being. For him, the child is, naturally, neither good nor bad, since it has no knowledge of either good or evil. To teach him to do good consciously and freely, he designates as the object of discipline, of moral education. The most important factor of moral education he finds in the family, and here the mother exerts the greatest influence. Of intellectual education, however, the school is the most powerful factor. To this he assigns, above all things, the task of teaching the art of thinking, and of assisting the child in its efforts to obtain fundamental ideas. At the same time, he looks upon the school as the transition from the family to society. His ideas are, however, followed out more systematically by his pupil Rosenkranz, to whom I pass.

Rosenkranz has laid down his ideas on education in a work entitled "*Pedagogics as a System*," of which an admirable translation, by Miss Anna C. Brackett, has been published lately in Mr. Harris's *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*. Education, he holds, can create nothing; it can only assist in developing existing actual possibilities into realities. Education can attain its aim only by setting the pupil to work, by arousing his self-activity. The general form of culture is habit; but the free subject (individual) must control the sys-

tem of his habits so that their existence will bring him to ever greater freedom. The subjective limit of education he finds in the individuality of the pupil; its objective limit, in the means for nursing and developing this individuality. The absolute limit of education lies in its aim which is the emancipation of the pupil, resulting in self-education, or, if you choose, in independence.

Thus, by the labors of these men, and of others whose mention I must here forego, the crude material, furnished by Rousseau, was crystallized into clear, beautiful, symmetrical purposes, which may be summed up in the formula with which we started in the first lecture, and which defines education as the development of independent individualities, fitted for life in society on the basis of morality and reason.

This formula has been reached by reasoning so cautious, so honest, so free from prejudice and passion, that all cotemporaneous and subsequent developments of science, with reference to the nature of man, have only served to corroborate it. For the sake of clearness, allow me to sketch a few of these developments, and to select for this purpose the studies of a few pioneers in psychological science.

Among the principal ones of these and, in time at least, among the first, is Herbart, who taught that the soul is a simple entity, subject to no change in its quality — the real, unchangeable recipient of ideas. These, subject to change, assume the forms — among which consciousness is one — whose sum is called mind. The view that the soul has a number of powers, of a higher and lower order, he declares to be a psycholog-

ical myth. Every single idea manifests itself, in consequence of its contrasts with others, as a force that sets the mass in motion. Thinking, feeling, imagining are only specified differences in the self-preservation of the soul. Consciousness is only the sum of relations in which the soul stands to other entities. Repressed ideas that have not entered consciousness are feelings; as they enter consciousness, they become appetites; and, united with the hope of success, the appetite becomes will.

Herbart was followed by Benecke, who contends that the soul, far from being a simple entity, is composed of a multiplicity of similar powers. These he divides into elementary (or primordial) and evolved powers; the latter resulting from the union of elementary powers with impressions and ideas. For him, then, the soul is no longer a constant, but a variable, subject to development. He deems the existence of an imagination, of a memory, of an understanding, of a will, etc. — as powers independent of ideas — an absurdity; and he shows that they are attributes or results of ideas. The simplest psychical formations are the sensuous sensations, which remain as *traces* in the soul. These traces multiply. The similar ones attract one another, and are strengthened into perceptions; similar perceptions, by an analogous process, unite to form concepts, conclusions, judgments, etc.; clearness of concepts, clearness of consciousness, constitutes understanding. The rapidity and other features of these developments depend, subjectively, on the strength (power to retain), vividness (tendency to assimilate), and susceptibility of the primordial powers; they depend, objectively, on the

number and intensity of the impressions, percepts, and concepts. Thus, starting from simple premises, he teaches that all manifestations of psychical force are the necessary results of the subjective peculiarities of the primordial powers, and of the multiplicity, intensity, and clearness of impressions.

Herbart had shown the absurdity of assuming a number of special, independent faculties of the soul; Benecke had proved that the soul is capable of development — a thing that grows; the next step was taken by Herbert Spencer, who shows that this growth is organic, subject to the ordinary laws of organic development. Thus, he made psychology strictly a natural science, to be henceforth modified, extended in its scope, corrected in its errors, limited in its theories, by the same laws of criticism that apply to other natural sciences. Availing himself of the discovery of the laws of evolution, of the correlation, the indestructibility, and mutability of forces, of their inseparability from matter, he has built up a system of psychology which, on account of its clearness and strict adhesion to scientific principles, is destined to supplant, or, rather, to crown the work of his predecessors, and to become one of the most potent agencies in hastening the recognition of correct principles of education.

LECTURE IX.

PESTALOZZI: BIOGRAPHICAL.

In order to review the work of practical educators during the period sketched in the last lecture, it becomes necessary to turn back to the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Here we find the philanthropinists, among whom Basedow, Campe, and Salzmann occupy the highest rank, engaged in attempts to give practical shape to Rousseau's views on education. They owe their generic name to the Philanthropinum at Dessau, an institution founded by Basedow under the auspices of Duke Leopold; an institution similar to Francke's pedagogium for the education of the sons of the nobility, but on purely philanthropic and cosmopolitan principles. Campe was great as an author of this school of pedagogy; and Salzmann is remarkable as the most practical of its followers, his philanthropinum, near Gotha, is the only one that has continued its existence to this day.

In a detailed history of pedagogy, the consideration of the labors of these men could not be passed over without injury to a full understanding of educational

progress; but my limited time and, more yet, my specific aim, compel me to content myself with a mere mention of them, and to pass at once to a more prominent figure — to Pestalozzi.

Pestalozzi was born on the 12th of January, 1746, at Zurich, in Switzerland. He lost his father, a physician, in 1751, and his education was left in the hands of a fond mother and of a faithful female servant, who had promised the dying father not to abandon the family. These two women were the constant and too watchful companions of his childhood. He says of his early education: "I grew up in the care of the kindest mother, who spoiled me with excessive tenderness. From one end of the year to the other, I was kept in the house. Every essential mean, every impulse to the development of manly vigor, manly experience, manly disposition, and manly exercise were wanting, although the peculiarities and weaknesses of my individuality needed them very much." Perhaps this accounts for the extraordinary want of practical sense that characterized all his undertakings, for his want of caution and circumspection, for his excesssive sentimentality, and for a peculiar almost childishness in all his doings and sayings. But it accounts, too, for his great inexhaustible love of mankind, for his unshaken faith, for his unlimited power of self-sacrifice, and for the fact that he assigned to the mother the most important position in the education of children.

He received his scholastic education exclusively in his native city. Zurich possessed, at that time, in addition to the elementary school, a so-called German school, in which ordinary school education found its

limit; a Latin school, which prepared for the learned professions; and a higher school, intermediate between the gymnasia and the universities of a later date. Pestalozzi visited these schools in their order. The first professional study to which he devoted himself was that of theology, but he soon abandoned this in order to devote himself to jurisprudence. This, too, failed to satisfy him, and, in 1767, he left school in order to devote himself wholly to agriculture.

He had read Rousseau's *Emile*, which had appeared a few years before, and he was affected by the book to a remarkable degree. He writes about this: "As soon as this book appeared, my exceedingly impractical dream-sense was transformed into enthusiasm by this exceedingly impractical dream-book. I compared the education which I had had, in the prison of home and school, with that which Rousseau sketched for his Emile. The home and school education of all the world seemed deformed to me, and I thought I had found the panacea for all these evils in Rousseau's *Emile*." He threw his books away, burned his manuscripts, and went to a widely-known, successful farmer in the Canton of Bern, to study the art of cultivating the soil, as well as the sufferings and wants of the country people, who languished at that time in a condition bordering on slavery and, in many respects, transcending it in abjectness.

A year afterward, he bought a tract of sterile heath-land, near the village of Birr, in the Canton of Argau. He had a house built on his farm, and devoted the land to the raising of madder. These lands, which he named "Neuhof" (the New Farm), he had bought with money borrowed on the prospects of a favorable marriage with

the daughter of a wealthy Zurich merchant. She became his wife at Neuhof, in 1769; but his efforts at farming did not prove successful, the creditor withdrew his capital, and her fortune was mostly lost. Pestalozzi himself ascribes these misfortunes to his absolute practical unfitness, his entire want of skill and capacity. The results of his practical efforts, in whatever he undertook, were as mean as his plans and aspirations were lofty. He himself says that "there was an immense contrast between his aims and his achievements, between what he wanted to do and what he did and could do."

About this time, he conceived the plan of uniting a poor-school or, rather, a home for poor children, with his farm. Several cities gave material support to the enterprise, and, in 1775, the new institution was opened with fifty children. In summer they were to be occupied with agricultural pursuits; in winter, with spinning and weaving. In leisure hours they were to receive instruction in speaking, reading, writing, etc. The wants of the children were to be supplied, in part at least, from the products of the children's work.

The new enterprise was taken up with enthusiasm, but it soon began to deteriorate. The children, mostly the sons and daughters of beggars, disliked work, and made the most unreasonable demands. In these they were abetted by their parents, who continued to visit the institution for the purpose of extortion and complaint. Many of the children ran away as soon as they had received new clothes. But Pestalozzi wanted to persevere; he would rather "share the last morsel with his children" than to give up the institution. He lived

"like a beggar, in order to teach beggars how to live like human beings." At last, in 1780, however, the institution had to be given up, because it lacked all the necessaries of life. "I was poor now," says Pestalozzi, in utter despondency; "I fared like all others who become poor through their own faults. I lost all confidence in myself, even in what I actually was and could do. My friends, too, loved me only hopelessly. All who knew me expressed the opinion that I was hopelessly lost."

But the self-sacrificing fidelity of his wife, Anna Schulthess, and the encouraging words of an influential friend at Basle, reassured him. During the same year, in 1780, he published his first work, entitled "*Evening Hours of a Hermit*," which contained the fundamental thoughts of all his subsequent efforts in behalf of education. In this book he attempted to show, with the warmth and affection peculiar to his womanly nature, that all school education which is not built upon the foundation of humane education, must mislead; that true education calls for the development of all the faculties and capacities in the individual; that this purely humane education must precede all training for special stations and callings; that it alone can lead to an independent, honorable, and happy life; that all instruction and all practice must have an intuitional basis, must be adapted to the child's peculiarities and surroundings; that, in these things, true self-dependent insight must take the place of authoritative verbiage, of dogmatic tradition; that a virtuous character, coupled with a deep religious sense, is the highest aim of all education. "All wisdom," he says, "rests upon

the vigor of a good heart obedient to truth; and all happiness, upon simplicity and innocence. I build all liberty upon justice, and justice upon love; and the source of all justice and of all earthly blessings, the source of love and charity, rests upon the great thought that all are children of God."

The next year, in 1781, he gave to the world his greatest achievement, a book entitled "*Lienhard and Gertrude: a Book for the People.*" Gertrude, the heroine of this romance, is Pestalozzi's ideal. In her management of the household, in her moral influence upon her husband — more especially, however, in her education of her children and in her aptness to teach — he held her up in this remarkable work as a model to all mothers.

The schools of his time were in a miserable condition; the teachers had little or no education; the nobility and wealthier classes demoralized and oppressed the common people; and to correct these errors and faults, these vices of society, Pestalozzi wanted to place the education of the children of the common people, including their instruction, in the hands of the mothers. Thus Pestalozzi, like Rousseau, aimed at a thorough regeneration of the race; but, unlike Rousseau, he left the rising generation in its natural soil, and would lead it to humanity in the family, under the influence of ideal mothers. For Pestalozzi, the child is from the beginning a social being, growing up in truly natural surroundings, and under the truly natural guidance of a mother who appreciates her responsibilities, and who has the necessary tact, skill, knowledge, energy, and love to meet them fully.

Pestalozzi himself characterizes the aim of the book, in the preface to the second edition, as an attempt "to effect a better condition of the people on the basis of the actual condition of the people and of their natural relations." "I saw," he says, "the misery of the people, and *Lienhard and Gertrude* were my sighs over this misery. The book was my first word to the heart of the poor and forsaken in the land. It was my first word to the heart of those who, for the poor and forsaken, are in God's stead in the land. It was my first word to the mothers of the land, and to the heart that God gave them, to be to their children what no human being on earth can be in their stead." "For," he says in another place, "if the home is not a holy temple of God, if the mother does not cultivate the head and heart of the child naturally, every other reform of social conditions is impossible."

The effect of this work fully justified Pestalozzi's expression: "I felt its worth; but only as a man who, in his dreams, feels the value of a good fortune." From all sides, from high and low, from philanthropic societies, from princes and statesmen, honors, thanks, and invitations poured in upon the author of *Lienhard and Gertrude*. But, through his impractical indecision, all came to naught, and he continued to bury himself on his dilapidated farm, occasionally throwing out an article, a pamphlet, or a book, until 1798, when he published again a more important work, entitled "*Investigations on the Course of Nature in the Development of Man.*"

In this work he summed up, based on Rousseau and Fichte, his views upon the aims of education. He holds that man is naturally innocent and helpless;

his helplessness leads him to insight; this to acquisition, possession, and, ultimately, to society. Social relations bring about a life of legal right which leads to liberty. At the same time, there is in man a natural benevolence, which culminates in religion. The work is valuable as a casket, containing many bright jewels of thought and sentiment, but of little value as a system of philosophy or as a basis for pedagogic efforts.

About the same year (1798), the French devastated the Canton of Unterwalden and burned the town of Stanz. Fatherless and motherless orphans wandered about the country without shelter, food, and clothing. Pestalozzi hastened to their rescue. The government placed an abandoned convent near Stanz at his disposal. This he fitted up for the orphans, of whom he gathered eighty between the ages of four and ten. They were all in the highest degree neglected, without discipline, ignorant, disorderly, in rags and filth — in a state of physical, mental, and moral degeneracy. To these outcasts of society Pestalozzi would be father, teacher, servant — nay, mother. "A seeing man," he himself says, "would not have ventured to do this; fortunately, I was blind, else I should not have ventured upon it."

As in Neuhof, he began by uniting instruction with work, but he soon recognized the inadequacy of this mode of proceeding. For the sake of better progress, he made an attempt to employ the older children as teachers of the smaller ones; he also introduced rhythmical speaking in concert. "I stood in their midst," he says, "spoke sounds to them, and caused them to imitate me; all who saw it were astonished at the effect. I did not know what I was doing, but I knew what I

wanted to do, and that was death or attainment of my purpose." However, all his efforts were in vain; he had undertaken more than one man can accomplish, and his institution would have perished of its own faults, had not external circumstances caused its earlier dissolution. In the summer of 1799, the French established a military hospital in his convent; most of the children were dispersed, and the remainder were given in charge of a local priest. Pestalozzi himself, after a short rest, accepted a position as teacher in an elementary school at Burgdorf, in the Canton of Bern, and repeated or, rather, continued his experiments in simplifying elementary instruction, as far as the mechanism of the school permitted it.

However, the limits of the school regulations restrained him too much, and he established in the next year, with an assistant, an independent educational institution in the same town. Here he published the book "*How Gertrude Teaches her Children*," which was followed, in 1803, by the "*Book for Mothers*." In these works he laid down his principles, and attempted to show mothers how they can become the elementary instructors of their children, thus enabling them to do without the school for this purpose. "For," said he, "as the child derives its first physical food from the mother, so it should also obtain its first mental food from the same God-given source." The contents of these books will form, however, the principal burden of my next lecture, so that we may now proceed with the remaining incidents in Pestalozzi's life.

In 1805, Pestalozzi established his institute at Yverdon, situated at the southern extremity of the lake of

Neuenburg, in western Switzerland, where he continued until 1825. Here Pestalozzi reached the summit of his glory. Yverdon became a center of attraction to which the noblest philanthropists of the time, from the plainest school-master to the greatest statesman, made pilgrimages, in order to bring away a sacred enthusiasm for popular education. From all countries they came — from France, from Germany, Italy, Spain, even from Russia and North America. Noble-hearted, high-minded youths joined him in order to become teachers of little children, and to be trained as his assistants.

In 1809, his institution numbered 15 teachers, 165 pupils between the ages of six and seventeen, from all parts of the world, and 32 adults that studied his methods. He writes, about this time: "The difficulties that opposed my enterprise in the beginning were very great. Public opinion was wholly against me. Thousands looked upon my work as quackery, and nearly all who believed themselves competent judges, declared it worthless. Some condemned it as a silly mechanism; some looked upon it as mere memorizing, while others contended that it neglected the memory for the sake of the understanding; some accused me of want of religion, and others of revolutionary intentions. But, thank God, all these objections have been overcome. The children of our institution are full of joy and happiness; their innocence is guarded; their religious feelings are fostered; their minds are cultivated; their knowledge increased; their hearts inspired with love of virtue. The whole is pervaded by the great spirit of home-union; a pure fatherly and brotherly spirit rules all. The children feel free; their activity is incited by their occupa-

tions; affection and confidence elevate and guide their hearts."

Still there were a number of evils which, perhaps in his enthusiasm in consequence of unexpected success, he did not see. There were the frequent interruptions by the visits of princes and ministers whom the master wished to gain for his ideas; there was the want of culture on the part of his teachers, who had little chance to correct their faults on account of the deficient arrangements of the household; there was the want of knowledge of men, of organizing talent, of pedagogic quickness of apprehension, of practical circumspection and methodic skill on the part of Pestalozzi himself; and, as a consequence perhaps, the devil of partisanship that invaded the hearts of his teachers, and caused an open rebellion shortly after the death of his admirable wife.

In 1816, a year after the demise of Anna Schulthess, twelve of his teachers seceded from the institution. Still he lingered on and, in 1818, even succeeded in adding to his charge a poor-school in the vicinity of Yverdon. This step contributed not a little to a loss of original purposes, and to a final dissolution of his whole enterprise in 1825.

"Truly, it seems to me," he writes at this time, "as if by this retirement I made an end to life itself; it pains me so." He found an asylum at Neuhof, with his grandson. Here he wrote his autobiography and his "*Swan's Strains*," in which he attempted to express, in a concise form, all that he had thought and felt on the subject to which he had devoted his life.

On the 17th of February, 1827, he died. His last words were: "I forgive my enemies; may they now

find peace, as I enter everlasting peace! I should have liked to live a month longer, in order to finish my task; but I thank God that he calls me away from life on earth. And you, my dearest ones, may you live in peace, and find your happiness in the quiet life of home!"

LECTURE X.

PESTALOZZI: HIS PRINCIPLES AND VIEWS.

A STRANGE phenomenon, indeed, is this Pestalozzi. For thirty years, as he says, in the height of his successes, he had not had time to read a book, so that he was more ignorant of the pedagogic achievements of his predecessors than the commonest school-master. He lacked the talent of organizing, was deficient in practical skill, a mere dreamer. By a sort of accident he had become acquainted with Rousseau's and, afterward, Fichte's views. He was fired by these, and induced to undertake an entire reorganization of elementary education.

Himself, he failed in all he undertook; but he succeeded in kindling in others an unprecedented enthusiasm for popular education; he succeeded in leading a host of others to unprecedented success. And this he did not accomplish by his own success, not by the force of argument or example, but only and alone by the force of his great love, which constituted his genius.

He says of himself: "What I am, I am by my heart."

He was desirous to contribute his share in enhancing the welfare of the race, in neutralizing and eradicating the physical and moral misery of mankind; and he looked upon education as the principal mean to accomplish this. His earnest pleadings for education, as the chief factor in the elevation and consequent relief of the masses, brought conviction to all, high and low, ruled and rulers, so that he is justly called the "father of popular education." Through him, Germany became the land of pedagogy; but his influence went far beyond the limits of German lands.

The family seemed to him the proper center of all educational efforts; but although he went too far in this view, and although, in his own direct labors, he aimed his efforts mainly at the school, he never lost sight, not even theoretically, of his great discovery that human nature itself must dictate the principles of education.

This discovery alone, urged by him again and again, with the eloquence of earnestness, upon all whom his words and deeds could reach, would have sufficed to make him one of the greatest benefactors of mankind. He thus became the inaugurator of a new epoch in education, the epoch of purely humane education; he created the possibility of basing the science of pedagogy upon anthropology and natural science; of making it, indeed, itself one of the branches of natural science.

His views of the nature and destiny of man were rather vague, but, on the whole, correct. They were not reached by careful philosophical analysis, but seemed to have sprung up in him, waked into existence by the magic power of his genius. Man appeared to

Pestalozzi in every direction as an organism; an independent organism, as far as he alone is concerned; an organic part, if viewed with reference to society, the race, or the universe. To enter into harmony with the whole — into communion with the Being of beings, with God — without losing his individuality, seemed to Pestalozzi man's highest destiny. Justice and love were to him man's highest virtues, in the intercourse with others; self-reliance the highest quality, with reference to himself.

For the education of man as an individual, as a separate individuality, Pestalozzi found the general formula in the simple and single word — evolution, development. Whatever powers man has, must be developed harmoniously, so as to form a harmonious, well-balanced whole. All individual development manifests itself as activity, as self-activity. This self-activity has two phases: one from without inward, receptive, acquisitive, learning; the other from within outward, expressive, productive, creative.

The former, the receptive phase of self-activity, is designated by the term intuition — *anschauung, looking at;* and the instruments which the mind uses, when engaged in it, are the senses. This phase will always precede the expressive, reproductive, or creative activity; it forms the basis, the foundation of the latter. Hence Pestalozzi's great principle: All instruction must be intuitional — *anschaulich* — must reach the mind through its senses. This phase of activity engaged his attention almost exclusively, as far as his reformatory efforts in methods of teaching extended; and he furnished an ABC of instruction which, while it was liable

to many improvements in form and scope, has never been assailed in its principles. He was well aware of the fact that this was only half the work required, and he labored hard to find an ABC of skill — of art, if you choose — of the expressive phase of self-activity, but without success. To find this ABC was reserved for Froebel; but were not Pestalozzi's achievements work enough, as well as glory enough, for one man?

He labored with great success to transform learning, the acquisition of knowledge, into an actual mental assimilation. And, in doing this, he gained another great point. He established beyond controversy that the ultimate aim of instruction is not to furnish man with knowledge and skill, but that these are valuable mainly as means to develop the mind and other powers of the human being. In other words, the material of instruction was to be used, in the first and foremost place, as an instrument for the development of the organism.

Hence, the mode in which the learner approaches the material of instruction or, respectively, the mode in which it is brought to him, is of the greatest importance, since it determines the beneficial or injurious, the furthering or hindering effect of instruction, with reference to mental development. Now, for the best way, he looks in the nature of man — that is, in the insight which the anthropological and psychological study of man has furnished. Thus he chose the only way that leads to truth; thus he freed pedagogy from all preconceived and dogmatical limitations, from all arbitrary fetters; made of it a natural science, to live and grow, henceforth, like other natural sciences. Thus

he laid low and ejected from the school the evil spirits of pedantry, that claim to be in full possession of truth, and form an insuperable barrier to progress; and installed in their stead that modest search for truth which moves always, and always forward.

What a great stride forward he himself made will appear even from a superficial review of his principles of teaching, as laid down in his last two books. He begins with the training of the senses, with perception, or, better, with perceptions; from these he leads the child gradually, surely, and as much as possible by its own efforts, to conceptions, judgments, conclusions. Every idea the child possesses has grown from the seed, and grown strong in indigenous soil, in the child's own mind. There is no pushing, no cramming, no pouring in; but only growth — healthy, vigorous, continuous, natural growth. What the child can not grasp is not forced upon it; whatever is beyond its comprehension is left for future time and increased power.

Specially, he proceeds always from known things to related unknown things, so that the learner may ever find a place for the new acquisition, may be enabled to bring the new acquisition into organic connection with what he already has or, rather, with what he already is. Abstract ideas grow gradually, almost laboriously, from concrete notions. He is a declared enemy of all mere verbiage, and fails to look upon parrot-like repetition of a statement or of an idea as knowledge. On the contrary, he asks that the child must develop the idea in its own mind, by its own self-active effort, before it can appreciate and, consequently, before it ought to receive the symbol or sign — the word.

In the examination of objects he always proceeds from the whole, *i. e.*, from the first impression, to the parts, *i. e.*, to careful analysis. In the building-up of ideas, in comparison and classification, he made sure, first, of particulars, elements; and proceeded slowly, gradually, continuously to general, more comprehensive ideas and names. At the same time, he aimed constantly at organic connection between the subject and the object, between the learner and the things learned; and strove to establish a similar connection between the various branches of instruction and practice.

Again, he insists upon constant self-activity on the part of the child. He never does for the child what it can do for itself, because only its own work, only the direct exercise of its own powers, will give strength to these and increase their substance, as it were. His (the teacher's) activity is only directing or guiding, only impelling or inducing, as the case may require. This is one of Pestalozzi's greatest points, and so prominent that Benecke, whom I have had occasion to mention in a previous lecture, says of Pestalozzi's method: "He aims throughout at self-active growth of insight, in continuous progress and exhaustive completeness." And Schwarz, a noted writer on pedagogical subjects, says of him: "He has cut a new road by the exercise of the powers in limited spheres, on a limited number of objects; from earliest youth, in every station of life, he wants to lead man to his greatest good, to his divine destiny. Every one is to be brought to a full appreciation of his own powers; and a pure, true appreciation of his worth is to bring him to the noblest use of his powers."

It would be to sin against truth, and thus to deprive history of its greatest power for good, if the faults of the great man were overlooked here. Some of these have already been hinted in this and the previous lecture. Among these are the want of caution and circumspection, of organizing talent and practical common sense; and more, perhaps, than these, his ignorance of pedagogic thoughts and deeds in previous times. He only knew the great misery around him, and Rousseau and his own good heart drove him to sacrifice himself in efforts to alleviate it.

But there are some other, perhaps minor faults, that are important enough to be mentioned here. Among these, his exclusive reliance upon the family, as an educational agent, stands at the head. Aside from the practical impossibility of educating a number of children of various ages in the family alone, this error of his shows an almost entire disregard of the claims of society upon the young human being, and of the necessity of training it, as early as possible, for social relations, for free intercourse with equals.

Again, short-sightedness or want of scope is manifested in the reduction of all sensuous impressions to *number*, *form*, and *word*. Certainly there are many other categories of sensual existence besides number, form, and word. Even if we look upon them symbolically, viewing *number* and *form* as the signs of *impressive* agents, and *word* as the sign of *expressive* action, it seems difficult to force all that impresses us and all our modes of expression within these terms.

Again, the use of mechanical exercises in enunciation and speaking had become a sort of superstition with

him. He used them to such a morbid excess that they contributed much to his defeats, inasmuch as his practice in this respect was directly opposed to his theory. This led him, too, in his propositions concerning the teaching of geography, history, anthropology, and natural science, into an artificial mechanism, a mind-killing verbiage, and memorizing of long lists of names that were as far removed from Pestalozzianism as darkness is from light.

His admirable principle that, in the study of objects, we should proceed from the near to the remote, caused him to forget that things may be too near for convenient and accurate observation, and misled him into the pernicious practice of beginning with the child's own body, a proceeding which, by insuring failure at the start, could not fail to bring his ideas into disrepute.

As akin to his over-estimation of the family as an educational factor, we should note, too, his over-estimation of the mother as the educator in the family. In this respect, the father seems to have no existence at all for him. This fault may be due to his own early education, and to the peculiar conditions of the society in which he lived and for which he worked; but even a little philosophical insight might have saved him from this grievous error. If it was his excellence to be what he was by his heart, it surely was his fault that his heart exercised a too despotic control over his head.

Thus it happened that, as a practical teacher, he stood far below mediocrity. He taught without plan; cared neither for time nor for the fatigue of the children; neglected reading and writing; neither developed nor repeated; entirely disregarded order and expediency in

the occupations of the children; worked only with the masses or classes, and took no heed of individuals; wasted much of his time in having the children repeat after him sentences which they did not understand; and, even in these exercises, neglected correctness and euphony of speech.

And yet, in spite of all these faults, he is the founder of modern pedagogy. He is this by his indefatigable zeal, his Christ-like self-denial, his enthusiasm for truth and human happiness. These qualities charmed all who came in his vicinity, and kindled in them similar feelings, induced them to improve upon his virtues and to steer past his faults.

As Jessen has said of him, "he was an enlightening creative hero of education; an eagle who, as Dante says of Homer, vanquishes all in his flight. No one has, like him, set the world ablaze in a holy enthusiasm for the great task of ennobling the human race; no one has, like him, shaken the stolid world and overcome its resistance. He was a man great through his faith in his ideal, great in his aims, great in the self-denial with which he fought for his ideal, great in his zeal to alleviate human suffering — a zeal which had become a part of his very being. Thus Pestalozzi's greatness consists, perhaps, more in the impulse he gave than it does in his direct achievements."

LECTURE XI.

FREDERIC FROEBEL — KINDERGARTEN CULTURE.

THE most enthusiastic admirer and disciple of Pestalozzi was, fortunately, a man singularly predisposed by his training to complete the task left unfinished by the great master. This man was Frederic Froebel.*

Like Pestalozzi, he found the aim of education in harmonious development, in the production of well-balanced human beings; like Pestalozzi, he looked for the principles of education in the laws of human nature; like Pestalozzi, he required growth from within outward, and relied, therefore, upon self-activity on the part of the learner, as the indispensable condition of success in educational labors. He accepted fully and unreservedly all that Pestalozzi had done, and built upon the law of intuition as a broad and firm basis. To this, however, he added the law of the "connection of contrasts." At the same time, he invented the ABC of the productive phase of self-activity, and showed how the exercise of the

* For a biographical sketch, I refer the reader to the preface of my *Kindergarten Culture*.

productive serves not only to strengthen the receptive powers and to enrich the mind and heart, but how it alone can render the acquisition of knowledge useful.

From the very beginning, he would have these two phases of self-activity — the receptive and the productive — go hand in hand. Every new intuition is to be used in new forms of expression, and to be combined in every possible manner with previous acquisitions, in more and more complicated, more and more directly useful productions. He keeps the learner ever busy, imitating and inventing with the ever-increasing stock of knowledge; and ever increasing the stock of ideas with the aid of imitations and inventions, in accordance with the law of the "connection of contrasts."

The harmonious development of man requires not only knowledge, but also skill; not only ideas, but also the application of ideas. Nay, if we consider that knowledge manifests itself usefully only through skill, that ideas enter life only through their application, we are to some extent justified in looking upon the latter as more important. Knowledge without skill, like a stuffed elephant, may challenge our astonishment, but can not exert any influence in life; it is as unproductive of either good or evil as the sword in the hands of a statue. The education of children, more especially in schools, has suffered for centuries, and particularly in modern times, from the fatal one-sidedness of paying almost exclusive attention to knowledge. Our time, as Froebel and his followers express it, is sick from a surfeit of knowledge. These truisms lay in the consciousness of thinking pedagogues long before Froebel — from Plato to Pestalozzi — but it was reserved for Froebel to let

the consciousness ripen into the deed by his invention of the Kindergarten.

Pestalozzi, wonderfully aroused by Rousseau's vigorous writings, and still more by the misery of the ignorant and unskilled masses, found the way of educating the child to independence in intuition, in the acquisition of ideas, and invented the ABC of knowledge; but his efforts to find an ABC of skill were fruitless, although he devoted himself to the task with conscious longing. Froebel, however, animated by an equally intense philanthropy, but endowed with more philosophical insight and more thorough knowledge, unveiled also this secret, and indicates, in his writings on "*The Education of Man*," the way to independence in skill, in the art of doing and inventing, in productive, creative activity.

With his predecessors in the mastership of pedagogy, he holds that education must begin at birth, and seeks the laws of pedagogic practice in the natural being and doing of the child. He observed how the latter, from the first dawn of consciousness, is ever eager to apply the acquired intuition — to make use of them — partly by simply reproducing them, partly by combining them with others formerly gained, in order to attain something new, or to enjoy the results of its creative activity. At the same time, he observed that the child, as a living being, is attracted most by living things, and, in the next place, by moving or movable objects.

These and similar observations led him to the invention of a number of *gifts* or playthings for little children. In the construction of these gifts he was guided by his law of the "connection of contrasts." He holds that we owe all our knowledge, primarily, to contrasts in the

qualities of surrounding objects. By these contrasts our attention is drawn to the objects, to their comparison, their observation; without them, comparison and observation — mental life, indeed — would be impossible, unthinkable.

These contrasts, however, are brought together again, reduced to a common idea by intervening degrees of the same quality in other objects. The discovery of these intervening degrees he designates by the name, "connection of contrasts," a process by which the mutual relations in the qualities of objects are brought out, and the unity, the oneness in them is unveiled. All thinking, he maintains, is reducible to this law; every step in the history of ideas rests upon it; even in emotional life, in the formation of taste and character, and in physical development, it holds good.*

The gifts, or playthings, consist of balls, cylinders, cones, variously dissected cubes, quadrilateral and triangular tablets, sticks, mats for weaving, etc. By means of these the child is gradually and pleasantly introduced into the world of ideas, gains notions of corporeality, of color, shape, size, number, etc. At the same time, it learns to use them in imitating and, consequently, fixing ideas gained from other objects, in inventing new, more or less abstract combinations of the component parts of the gift.

The results of the child's more or less self-active efforts are classified by Froebel as *forms of cognition, of*

---

*For a full discussion and illustrations of this law, as well as for a detailed description of Froebel's gifts, I refer the reader to my *Kindergarten Culture.*

life, and of beauty. By the forms of cognition the child obtains and fixes new ideas, gains knowledge; by the forms of life it reproduces or expresses, more or less faithfully, ideas gained from surrounding objects; and by the forms of beauty, or symmetrical arrangements of the parts of the gift, it trains its inventive powers and forms its taste.

Thus the third gift, a two-inch cube dissected into eight one-inch cubes, offers combinations of its component parts — *forms of cognition* — by which the child obtains ideas of number, shape, size, and relations of position. Again, it enables the child to build, in rude outline, tables, chairs, walls, ladders, bridges, and other *forms of life;* and the eight cubical blocks offer much scope in producing a variety of symmetrical arrangements, or *forms of beauty.*

He lays great stress, too, upon the development of physical vigor, grace, and skill, by means of calisthenic and gymnastic exercises; upon the cultivation of taste, scope, and power in language, by means of declamation, song, and lively conversation; and upon the simultaneous training of hand and head in imitative and inventive drawing on slates and paper, specially prepared and ruled for the guidance of the little artists.

A most important feature of his invention we have, again, in the social games, and in the fact that all the occupations of the kindergarten are managed in such a way as to unfold and train the social nature of the child. From the very beginning, the child is taught by direct experience that it finds the richest source of happiness in doing good — in usefulness; and that it gains strength for greater usefulness in the free, voluntary union with

others, in the social subordination to common purposes. At the same time, the kindergarten takes care not to drown individuality, but, by enlarging its scope, continually offers new and strong incentives for its full development.

Froebel looks upon the little children as organic beings, whose growth must be led and followed by the educator as the growth of plants is led and followed by the gardener; hence the name kindergarten — garden for children. It is true that he would have an actual garden connected with these institutions, so that the child may, by direct observation, become familiar with the laws of growth, and learn to know and love nature, of which it, too, is an exponent. Still, such a garden, while it is eminently desirable, is not an essential feature of the kindergarten, since there are many other ways to accomplish similar results. Among these, the cultivation of plants in pots or boxes, and occasional excursions into the fields and forests, occupy a prominent place.

Froebel, however, would make the kindergarten not only a place for the proper education of little children, but also a training-school for mothers and nurses. He appeals most earnestly to mothers to visit the kindergarten, to attend its teachings, to practice there the art of bringing up the little ones; and he would establish institutions in which young girls can prepare themselves for the difficult and responsible duties of a mother or nurse. Fortunately, his appeals were not unheeded; for Europe, and more especially Germany, can boast of a number of such training-schools, doing admirable work, increasing daily in scope and influ-

ence, and sending out annually hundreds of enthusiastic and skillful missionaries in the good cause.

Again, Froebel's plans did not end with the kindergarten. Finding the *body pedagogic* diseased, he did not propose to cure it by the mere addition of a healthy member, which would be doomed to become a prey to the general degeneracy of that body; but he meant that the kindergarten should leaven the entire system of teaching children, at home and at school. He would have it used as an entering wedge to break down whatever is illogical, unnatural — nay, inhuman — in family and school education; he would make it the forerunner of school and youth gardens, *i. e.*, of institutions in which the learner is placed in the most favorable circumstances for self-active, organic growth in every direction of his being, where knowledge and skill, saying and doing, theory and practice, go hand in hand at every step.

Indeed, his labors have already brought forth rich fruit. Even a superficial review of the progress of educational principles in modern times, yields abundant proof of the great influence that Froebel has exerted upon the spirit which animates this progress. Everywhere we see the tendency to technical education; drawing forms a branch of instruction in all well-appointed school systems, even in our country; calisthenic and gymnastic exercises gain ground from day to day; music cheers the souls of thousands of little learners, where a few years ago there was only the monotonous drawl of recitation or the excited tone of the rebuking teacher.

Again, it can not be denied that the employment of

female teachers, particularly in elementary schools, is due, to a great extent, to Froebel's influence. He held that teaching the little ones is the natural calling of woman; that by her greater tenderness, her deeper sympathy for the yearnings of children, by her quicker perception of their needs and wants, by her more intimate relationship to the child, by her readier adaptability to its ways, by her more graceful movements and her more winning words, she is much better fitted than man — other circumstances being the same — to arouse the child to free obedience and eager self-activity, and to implant the seeds of love and purity in its heart.

Similarly, the growing employment of love, good habit, and reason in discipline, in preference to brute force; the greater attention paid to the plays of children; the gaining practice of co-education of the sexes, at least in elementary schools; the war against one-sidedness in education; the greater respect paid to child-nature; the increasing value attached to self-activity and individuality; the demand for less routine and more work in the branches of instruction; the gradual decline of artifice before the claims of nature; the steady retreat of machine-teaching before natural development, are unquestionably due, in a high degree, to Froebel's influence.

It is a significant fact, when we consider what stress was laid by Froebel upon the training of women for the important work of early education, that, both in this country and in Europe, the leading apostleship for the new education was assumed by women. In Europe, the baroness Bertha von Marenholtz-Buelow has devoted

her life to the diffusion of Froebel's teachings. She has established kindergartens in France, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, England, and Italy; and Austria has even incorporated the kindergarten with her public school system. In America, Miss Eliza P. Peabody and her sister, Mrs. Horace Mann, first drew public attention to the new education by the publication of their "*Kindergarten Guide*," and by the establishment of a genuine English kindergarten in Boston, a few years ago.

Thus the good work is progressing nobly; and the regeneration of education, on the basis of Froebel's ideas, is slowly and surely finding its way into the home, as well as into the school.

LECTURE XII.

SUMMING UP — CONCLUSION.

We see from the preceding lectures how the Caucasian race has gradually and surely approached the principles of development or evolution in the work of education. It appears that these principles were already, in a degree, felt and followed by the Greeks; on the other hand, even the superficial student of the educational systems of our day will often come across practices that seem to be fully as far removed from the laws of development as Chinese education has been from time immemorial.

This must needs be so, since the roots of our civilization lie far down in Greek soil; and as far as our civilization contains truth, Greek culture must have contained the seeds of truth. For truth may displace or destroy falsehood, may even grow strong upon it, but never can come from it. Nor can we, on the other hand, hope ever to reach full, unalloyed, absolute truth, error ever will surround us, and eat its way into the inmost life of many, to goad the race on to that constant search, that eager yearning for truth, which constitutes progress.

The Greeks emancipated education from the curse of caste and asserted the claims of individuality; not, it is true, without a grand final struggle between Plato, who would sacrifice the individual to the state, and who calls for an equal, common, public education, and Aristotle, the champion of individual liberty and of the sacredness of family ties, with which public education never must interfere. At the same time, the Greeks teach the race to look upward beyond the realms of merely sensual existence, establish high ideals of education — "the Good and the Beautiful" — and demand harmony in culture; while their greatest teachers, Pythagoras and Socrates, pave the way to sound natural and rational methods of instruction.

Subsequently, the excessive idealism of Greek culture found a corrective in the sturdy realism, the practical common sense of the Romans; and when Rome lay dying of her own gross sins, Christianity came to save the highest achievements of the race, and to fertilize them with new elements of health and vigor.

Christianity, a child of Semitic civilization — a civilization that looked with the greatest reverence upon the family, and considered the fear of God as the highest virtue — engrafted upon European culture the principle of strict humanity, liberated it from the bane of arbitrary and accidental external distinctions among men, raised woman to full equality with her mate before God, and taught respect for children, the framers of the future.

And when, in the middle ages, its high teachings had been misapplied by the selfishness of man for sordid and ambitious ends, or perverted by diseased

superstition into a curse, blasting earthly happiness and paralyzing usefulness in real life, philosophy came to the rescue, dispelled the clouds, the Sun of Truth was again revealed, and his restoring and reforming rays aroused European civilization to a new and better life. Progress, that had slumbered so long, awoke to new vigor and made rapid strides under the leadership of Bacon, Locke, Descartes, Spinoza, Kant, and a host of others.

Through the influence of these great men, pure, unalloyed humanity became the soul; the harmonious development of well-balanced, self-dependent, vigorous, and virtuous human beings, the aim of educational efforts. Man was shown to be an organic being, subject in all his manifestations of existence to ordinary, natural laws; growing, developing, in all directions of his being, organically, from within outward; and all educational ends and means that are not in accordance with these conquests of philosophy were proved to be pernicious, and are gradually yielding before the supreme power of better insight.

Among the many prominent mediators of this better insight, we have singled out Comenius, Francke, Pestalozzi, and Froebel, each one representing some important phase in the growth of a school practice, corresponding in scope and spirit with the laws and aims of the developing education: Comenius as the pioneer of vernacular schools, of intuitional teaching, and of analytico-synthetic methods; Francke, as the founder of scientific and technical schools, the champion of individuality and of the greater importance of training the pupil's powers and forming his character, compared with mere

instruction; Pestalozzi, as the father of popular education and expounder of natural methods in the acquisition of knowledge; and Froebel, as the apostle of self-activity, of the productive side in child-nature, and of female influence in the work of education.

After thus reviewing some of the leading features in the history of developing education, it behooves us to ask ourselves to what extent our own school system, our immediate schools, our personal principles and practice, satisfy in tendency, scope, and character the requirements of the "new education," so that our work may reap direct benefits from our study. Of course, only the first of these, our school system, is open for our common consideration; and, with reference to this, I beg leave to offer a few average results of my own personal observation.

It is a source of just congratulation to the American citizen, that the political and social institutions of his country are more favorable, nearer to humanity than those of any other great nation in the world. Our Constitution grants equal political rights to all citizens, and respects personal freedom to such an extent that it leaves the conscience of all men free, with reference to religious opinions and practices. Socially, we judge men by their inner worth and by their achievements, caring not for external or accidental distinctions, except where fashion has imported folly from abroad. Even the exorbitant value placed upon wealth has its root in this, since wealth is the commonest reward of excellence. Hence, too, woman — showing herself in so many activities the equal of man — occupies among us a higher social position, and

exerts a greater influence upon the general welfare, than in any other civilized country. Even children are treated with greater consideration and looked upon with more respect than elsewhere.

These things have developed in the American citizen an almost instinctive independence of character, which is exceedingly favorable to the development of strong individualities. Add to this the traditional energy and endurance of the American, which he owes to the early struggles of his forefathers with a reluctant wilderness and an obstinate race, and to the glorious war of the revolution; add our great national power and the vastness of our resources that render us wholly independent of other nations, and there seems to be no reason why our country should not stand foremost in culture, and our educational systems be the best, nearest to the ideal of the great teachers whom we have reviewed.

On the other hand, the doctrine of equal rights may produce jealousy in those less favored with capacity or success, and may bring about an equalization, particularly in educational efforts, which is adverse to the assertion and development of individuality. Excessive respect and consideration shown to the young may breed a self-satisfied conceit, which, in its turn, brings forth indolence. The ease of making a living may strengthen this indolence, and render man content with the acquisition of wealth and comfort, or pervert his energy into a nervous chase after money, which gives him the means to plunge into a whirlpool of gross, exciting, sensual pleasures.

Thus, the very blessings that are justly our greatest boast, expose us to a self-conceit, an indolence, a sensu-

ality, an egotism, that may pervert those very blessings into curses, if we are not ever humbly watchful of ourselves. Add to this, again, the fact that we owe to our mother-country, England, an almost bigoted respect for authority and precedent; a conservativism that hangs ever like lead upon the skirts of progress; a utilitarian tendency that worships the real, while it scorns the ideal or smiles at it, and we can readily understand that much energy will yet have to be expended, if the manhood of our country is to justify the hopes and expectations of its youth.

Yet, if we take our school system, the mightiest factor of the future, as a criterion, we have reason to feel reassured and encouraged. It is true, our school system still struggles with many difficulties and suffers from a host of faults. So many parents and school trustees have no idea of the importance or the aims of true education. A great number of teachers look upon their work as a temporary, convenient mode of making a living. The school aims, in so many instances, almost exclusively at directly visible results, and crushes all efforts at the development of mental and physical vigor, of individuality and character, under the dead weight of percentage; it would force all the pupils to do a certain number of things equally well, and thus hampers progress, favors show, and does nothing very thoroughly nor very far; it reduces the teacher to a recitation machine and the pupil to a memorizing contrivance; it does, indeed, many things that are useless or injurious, and neglects many things that are indispensable, if education is to prepare the young for full usefulness and true happiness.

On the other hand, our people as a whole, at least in the states that have enjoyed the benefits of a common school system, seem to be aware of the necessity of schools, seem to feel that good comes or can come from them. This feeling may, in many cases, be quite indistinct and ill-defined; but it is sufficiently keen to render them ever ready to sacrifice wealth for the maintenance and improvement of their schools. No country in the world, except, perhaps, some portions of Switzerland, can boast of expending so much for schools, in proportion to the cost of other public concerns, as these favored states; and all the states of the Union are gradually but surely drifting to this desirable condition.

The wish to send to school is so general and grows so rapidly, that the necessity of compulsory laws becomes ever less urgent. Our school-houses are built commodiously, with fair provisions for light, air, heat, and for comfort in the seats. Our school appliances, within the narrow but expanding scope of our subjects of instruction, are good and improving. In the methods of instruction, imperfect as they are, much of the work is thrown upon the learner — often, indeed, more than his powers justify. The demand for play-grounds, for physical training, for respect to the development of the body, for technical instruction, for a more intimate intercourse with nature, is steadily increasing. In discipline there is a growing tendency to do away with force and mere authority, and to rely more and more upon insight and good habits on the part of the pupil; although, of late, a cheap sort of military discipline has been retarding sound progress quite considerably.

At the same time, the number of parents and school trustees that appreciate the requirements of a truly good education is gaining from year to year. And, best of all, the number of teachers who feel the divinity of their calling, and who are willing to forego more lucrative or less trying occupations for the sake of devoting their lives to this, is rapidly swelling, thanks to the liberality of the people and to the influence of normal schools. Before the stout hearts, the clear heads, and the skillful hands of these men and women, the enemies of progress and of a rational, natural, humane education — active and passive, animate and inanimate, be their name ignorance or incapacity, pedantry or pretense, selfishness or prejudice — will be repelled into the past as steadily and surely as time marches into the future.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
A 001 413 600 6